THE FORMULARY MATERIAL IN FIRST PETER

A Study According to the Method of
TRADITIONSGESCHICHTE

by

Kazuhito Shimada

Cyril C. Richardson
Dean of Graduate Studies

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Theology in
Union Theological Seminary

Dedicated To
Sumoto Free Methodist Church (Japan),
My Mother-Church,
And To Its Minister
For His Twenty-Six Years of Service
For The Church

PREFACE

This study has originated in a simple question: what is the nature of the literary similarities which I Peter shares with certain other writings in the New Testament? This question had already been in my mind when I came across a suggestive article by Manfred Karnetzki, entitled "Die galiläische Redaktion im Markusevangelium" (ZNW 52, 1961, pp. 238-272). While this article is basically oriented to a redaktionsgeschichtliche examination of Mark, on the last two pages Karnetzki lists several notable similarities shared by this Gospel and I Peter, and he attributes them to their common derivation from the 'communal kerygmatic traditions of the primitive Church.' From Karnetzki's list and his explanation I drew an inference as to the literary similarities, i.e., the possibility of a history-of-tradition inquiry into them for a better explication than taking them simply as the evidence for a direct literary dependence of one writing upon another. In a two-page printed résumé (distributed to the exegesis class on I Peter conducted by Dr. J. Louis Martyn) on I Ptr. 3:13-22, I named one section 'History-of-Tradition Problem', and in that section I referred to a possible implication of Karnetzki's article for an examination of the literary affinities. This was the beginning of my interest in the plausibility of the history-of-tradition approach. Dr. Martyn's repeated suggestions made to the class, i.e., to examine I Peter (as well as other N.T. books) against the background of the history of thought of the early Church, has been an incentive to develop my initial interest and observation into a study carried out from the methodological angle.

The present study is concerned primarily with examining '(liturgical-) formulary' material (we shall have an occasion to define this awkward expression later), represented in I Peter. Since a proper history-of-tradition inquiry of I Peter should also include the study of parenetic material of several sorts, the use of the Old Testament, and numerous other fragmentary instances of similarity, our study does not pretend to be anything more than a 'programme note' for an application of the methodology to which we subscribe. We are ready to expect that the outcome of the present study, owing to its limited scope, will be a tentative one. Nevertheless, this present study does maintain its own unity, and it deserves to be submitted to public criticism. He who judges whether or not the line of inquiry followed in this study may be a legitimate and plausible one for a proper elucidation of the nature of the literary similarities, is the reader of this study, and not I; hereby I commit myself to his fair criticism.

My use of footnotes may seem cumbersome to some readers, I am afraid; an apologetic note for it, therefore, will be in place. It seems that no one who is engaged in a study in a well-trodden field like that of New Testament studies, is entitled to claim originality for his own inquiry unless it is based upon a (reasonably) thorough survey of the history of research on the subject matter with which he deals. It also seems hardly possible for any New Testament student to carry out a study without being dependent, in some measure, upon the 'fruits of the toil' of his academic predecessors. Far from claiming any originality or independence, what I have tried to do was to learn from my predecessors and to record my indebtedness to them. The footnotes are merely the traces of this attempt on my part and nothing more. (I have to confess that, in the course of my research, I was often left with an impression that some studies could have taken forward steps, if those studies had been grounded upon a critical re-examination of previous studies on the same subject matter.) With regard to the places where I have indicated my disagreement with the views held by others, I would like it to be known that I have tried to learn and did learn from them, and I am indebted to them at least for their inciting me to present alternative views.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the professors of the New Testament department of Union Theological Seminary, Dr. W. D. Davies, my academic advisor for these six years, Dr. John Knox, the chairman of the committee for this dissertation, and Dr. J. Louis Martyn, the supervisor of my work on the dissertation, for their inspiring lectures and seminars. Especially Dr. Martyn has generously devoted his precious time to discussing with me the problems and weaknesses in detail at every stage of the preparation of the present work; to his frank criticisms and suggestions I am immeasurably indebted. My personal acquaintance with these professors itself has been, along with my contact with them on an academic level, an enriching, educational experience to me; for this privilege and, above all, for their patience shown to me, I render my thanks to them.

By undertaking the laborious task of correcting my English, Miss Barbara Marjorie Griffis and Mr. Richard H. Pachella (and Mrs. Robert Hamerton-Kelly on the Prolegomena of the second draft) have helped me to eliminate unnecessary errors and banal stylistic features from the drafts of the present work. Detailed comments made by Miss Griffis were helpful to clarify my views at not a few points. For their friendly assistance I am thankful.

My thanks are due also to the officers of the Seminary, especially to Dr. C. C. Richardson, who heads the Committee on Graduate Studies, and to Dr. M. Searle Bates, the former advisor to foreign students, for their making the necessary arrangements in financial matters for these years.

I wish to register my appreciation also to the New Testament department of McCormick Theological Seminary for granting me the T. B. Blackstone Fellowship in New Testament Greek. It was an undeserved honour on my part to receive it, and it provided a substantial financial help for my first two years at Union.

My parents and brother and sister are to be mentioned for their untiring support through prayer and encouragement, without which I could hardly have continued to study during this unexpectedly long period of paroikia ('sojourning').

Kazuhito Shimada
March 1, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS x

PART ONE: PROLEGOMENA

Chapter

I. PURPOSE 2

II. A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE RESEARCH ON FIRST PETER 5

Section 1: The Views That Uphold The Petrine Independence 6

(i) B. Weiss 7
(ii) E. Kuehl 11
(iii) E. Scharfe 13
(iv) C. Bigg 15
(v) Concluding Remarks 17

Section 2: The Views That Affirm the Petrine Dependence 18

(i) Preliminary Remarks 18
(ii) Examination of Parallel Words and Phrases Presented by Mitton 26
(iii) Examination of Parallel Passages Presented by Mitton 36
(iv) Concluding Remarks 48

Section 3: Form-Critical Approaches . 53

(i) Parenetic Material 53
A. Catechism 53
B. The Haustafel 57
C. 'Persecution Form' 58

Chapter Page

(ii) Liturgical Material 60
A. Credal Formula 60
B. Hymnic Material 64
C. Liturgical Prayer 67
(iii) Baptismal Discourse 67
(iv) Baptismal Liturgy 69
(v) *Testimonia* 72
(vi) Concluding Remarks 75

III. METHODOLOGY 80

PART TWO: THE FORMULARY MATERIAL IN I PETER

I. DEFINITION OF FORMULARY MATERIAL 84

Section 1: Preliminary Definition . 84

Section 2: Criteria For Detecting the 'Formulary' Material 90

Section 3: An Outline of the Procedure to Examine the Formulary Material. 105

II. A SALUTATION FORMULA IN 1:2 107

Section 1: Preliminary Observation . 107

Section 2: Examination of the Salutation Formula in 1:2 108

III. A EULOGICAL FORMULA IN 1:3-4 139

Section 1: Preliminary Observation . 140

Section 2: A History-of-Tradition Examination 159

IV. A FRAGMENTARY THEOLOGICAL FORMULA IN 1:17a 199

Section 1: Preliminary Observation . 200

Section 2: A History-of-Tradition Examination 203

V. A HYMNIC FRAGMENT IN 1:18-19 230

Section 1: Preliminary Observation . 230

Section 2: A History-of-Tradition Examination 238

Chapter Page

VI. A CHRISTOLOGICAL FORMULA IN 1:20 . . . 262

Section 1: Preliminary Observation. 262

Section 2: A History-of-Tradition Examination 270

VII. A CHRISTOLOGICAL FORMULA IN 3:18-22 . . 303

Section 1: Preliminary Observation. 306

Section 2: A History-of-Tradition Examination 318

VIII. DOXOLOGICAL FORMULAE AND AMEN IN 4:11d; 5:11 396

Section 1: Preliminary Observation. 398

Section 2: Examination of the Doxological Formulae in 4:11d; 5:11 407

Section 3: A Brief Survey of the Use of Amen 415

CONCLUSION 422

EXCURSUS 427

BIBLIOGRAPHY 435

PRECIS 476

CURRICULUM VITAE 480

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.T.	(das) Alte Testament
ATD	*Das Alte Testament Deutsch*
Bauer	(W. Bauer, ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (edited and adapted by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich)
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. H. Briggs (ed.), *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
Blass-Debrunner	F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*
BZS	*Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen*
CGTSC	*The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges*
Charles, *APOT*	R. H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols)
DSS	(the) Dead Sea Scrolls
EB	*Etudes Bibliques*
E.t.	English translation
Exp.T.	*The Expository Times*
GHAT	*Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*
HCNT	*Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*
HDS	J. Hastings (ed.), *A Dictionary of the Bible* (5 vols)
HNT	*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*

HTKNT	*Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*
ICC	*The International Critical Commentary*
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (4 vols)
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*
J.t.	Japanese translation
JThS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
Kautsch, *APAT*	E. Kautsch (ed.), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (2 vols)
KEK	*Kritisch-Exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament*
Leiturgia	K. F. Müller & W. Blankenburg (ed.), *Leiturgia* (vol. Iff.)
Liddell-Scott	H. G. Liddel & R. Scott (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.)
MNTC	*Moffatt New Testament Commentary*
N.F.	Neue Folge
N.S.	New Series
N.T.	(the) New Testament; (das) Neue Testament
NTD	*Das Neue Testament Deutsch*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
O.T.	(the) Old Testament
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RGG	*Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3rd ed. 6 vols)
RHPr	*Revue d'Histoire et la Philosophie religieuse*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology*
RSV	The Revised Standard Version

Str.-Bill.	H.L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (6 vols)
TJ	*Theologische Jahrbücher*
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TR	*Theologische Rundschau*
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*
TWNT	G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (vol. Iff.)
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft*

PART ONE

PROLEGOMENA

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE

The purpose of this present study is to examine the literary similarities, which I Peter shares with certain other writings in the N.T. writings, from a 'history-of-tradition' (traditionsgeschichtliche) point of view.[1] By this we mean an attempt to locate the place of I Peter in a wider and more vital context of the life and thought of the early Church than that hitherto assigned to the Epistle. In our study we shall limit ourselves almost entirely to examining the traditional 'formulary' (formelhaftige)[2] material represented in our Epistle, and we shall give special attention to the question how the traditional, formulary material reflected in I Peter is related to that represented in the various strata of similar material in the rest of the N.T. literature.

The fact that our Epistle contains a number of 'literary points of contact', or literary affinities, with the rest of the N.T. writings has been noted by scholars. The somewhat unduly neglected work by Foster[1] enumerates over four hundred cases (with regard to the canonical writings) though with various degrees of affinity. It has been rather customary, especially among the so-called critical scholars, to explain those 'points of contact' in terms of their being parallel with, and mostly their showing dependence upon the Pauline epistles. Since, however, the form-critical method came to be applied even to I Peter,[2] along with the progress of research in various directions,[3] the traditional critical approach which assesses the literary relations simply in terms of Petrine dependence seems to be brought into serious question. The extent and nature of literary similarities seem to have to be examined anew in the light of the impact brought about by the form-critical studies and the new developments: for instance, the possibility, to say the least, of common derivation from the traditional, early Christian formulary expressions has to be taken into serious consideration in examining and assessing those literary affinities. This observation of ours is, so to speak, a working hypothesis for our present study; what we intend to do now in this study is to try to test this observation from a definite methodological angle.

---

[1] We will define our methodological position below, after giving a survey of the previous research on I Peter.

[2] We shall define what we mean by 'formulary' material and shall present criteria to detect it in the first chapter of Part Two.

---

[1] Ora Delmer Foster, The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913), XVII, pp. 363-538.

To my knowledge, the only scholar who refers to this work is F. W. Beare (The First Epistle of Peter (2nd ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 9, fn. 1. Also on his list of the general literature on p. 45. Scholars like A. E. Barnett, Paul Becomes A Literary Influence (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941, esp. pp. 51-69) or C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), esp. pp. 176-197, who specifically deal with the problem of literary relations of I Peter, do not indicate their acquaintance with Foster's work.

[2] This is signalized by the monumental commentary by E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan & Co., 1946; 2nd ed., 1955).

Chronologically speaking, Selwyn's basic approach finds its precursors, e.g., in A. Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903); and in Martin Dibelius, Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur (Sammlung Göschen series; Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1926), Vol. II, esp. pp. 43ff; also pp. 67-76. Cf. M. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.--ausserhalb der Evangelien--," TR, N.F. 3, 1933, pp. 207-242.

An attempt has recently been made by Moule to elucidate the situations contributive to the birth of the N.T. from a form-critical point of view; C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the N.T. (New York/Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962).

[3] For instance, from the viewpoint of 'analysis of traditional material', aided by the form-critical method, various attempts have been made to identify various sorts

---

of pre-Pauline, traditional material in the Pauline epistles. One of suggestive presentations made in a popular fashion is A. M. Hunter's, Paul and His Predecessors (1941; 2nd ed., 1961).

Among the commentaries on the Pauline epistles, one by Otto Michel on Romans, Der Brief an die Römer (KEK, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), seems to contain a number of valuable suggestions with regard to the pre-Pauline material incorporated in Romans.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE RESEARCH ON FIRST PETER

Before entering into the discussion of the subject under consideration, we shall survey briefly the various approaches made in the research on I Peter. This survey will be carried out from the viewpoint of how the alleged literary relations (on the basis of the literary affinities) of I Peter to the various strata of the traditions and writings in the N.T. have been examined and estimated. The issue of literary relations is closely bound up with, and has an important bearing upon, the introductory problems (e.g., the problem of literary-theological influence, date of writing and the authorship, etc.).[1] We shall limit ourselves to the primary task of illustrating how the cases have been presented in the various approaches as regards the literary relations. We undertake this survey in order to establish our own methodological position, on the basis of which our study will be carried out.

---

[1] With regard to the inseparable connection between the problem of literary relations and those of historical circumstances: cf. e.g., W. M. Ramsey, The Church and the Roman Empire Before A.D. (3rd ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894), pp. 279-294. Also G. W. Blenkin, The First Epistle General of Peter (CGTSC; Cambridge: The University Press, 1914), pp. liiiff., esp. pp. lxvii-lcviii. Feine-Behm-Kümmel, Einleitung in das N.T. (13th ed.; Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1964), esp. pp. 304-310. A succinct and pertinent remark on the connection is given by Mitton, op. cit., pp. 181-182.

Probably one of the best introductions to our Epistle is that by A. F. Walls in A. M. Stibbs's The First Epistle General of Peter ("The Tyndale N.T. Commentaries" series; London: The Tyndale Press, 1959), pp. 15-68. The popular character of the series should not keep anyone from recognizing the competence and thoroughness of the discussion carried out by Walls.

The various approaches hitherto made may be classified into the following three main groups:

i) the views that uphold the Petrine independence,
ii) the views that uphold the Petrine dependence, and
iii) various form-critical observations.

SECTION 1

The Views That Uphold the Petrine Independence

Petrine independence was affirmed by Bernhard Weiss, Ernst Kühl, Ernst Scharfe and Charles Bigg. Their works were published in the second half of the nineteenth century and the earliest years of the twentieth, and invited critical reactions in the subsequent decades, especially in the case of Weiss, the archrepresentative of the views.

The view of each scholar will be taken up in the order of the names listed above.

Only after I completed the survey in this chapter, an article by R. P. Martin, "The Composition of I Peter in Recent Study," Vox Evangelica, 1962, 29-42, has come into my hand. This article appears to be one of the most recent and comprehensive surveys on the particular subject related to I Peter.

(i) B. Weiss

Weiss's[1] basic view of the literary relations may be summarized in two propositions, i.e., the originality and independence of I Peter, and the dependence of Romans and Ephesians upon our Epistle. With regard to the first he presents the following:

First, a mere enumeration of words common both to I Peter and the Pauline epistles is not sufficient to prove the former's literary dependence upon the latter, since some of the words appear, either in the rest of the N.T. or in the LXX.[2] All the derivations common to both are also common in Classical and Hellenistic Greek to the extent that they can hardly be regarded as peculiar to Paul.[3]

---

[1] Bernhard Weiss, *Der petrinische Lehrbegriff* (Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Schultze, 1885). Cf. his *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik* ("Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen," 2nd series, no. 9; Berlin: Verlag von Edwin Runge, 1906).

[2] E.g., δόξα, σωτηρία, δικαιοσύνη, κληρονομία, καλεῖν, λόγος θεοῦ, ὑπακοεῖν, ἀπειθεῖν, φῶς, σκότος, ἄγνοια, ἐκλεκτός, σάρξ, ψυχή (*Lehrbgriff*, p. 384).

[3] E.g., πνευματικός (esp. Rom. 15:16), ἡσύχιος (I Cor. 4:5. Cf. Rom. 2:29), ὑπερεχεῖν (Cf. Rom. 13:1; I Tim. 2:2), εἴπερ, εἴτε . . . εἴτε, καταρτιζεῖν (Cf. Heb. 13:21), στηριζεῖν (Lk. 22:32; Jas. 5:8; II Ptr. 1:12; Rev. 3:2), ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου (Cf. I Cor. 14:25; Rom. 2:16), καρδία (Cf. ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος in Rom. 7:22; II Cor. 4:16). *Lehrbegriff*, p. 385. Cf. pp. 386-388.

Secondly, our Epistle shows a marked absence of the technical expressions peculiar to Paul's system of teaching;[1] in regard to the 'Pauline' technical expressions in I Peter, they are either cases with less exact affinities[2] or common Christian expressions or those derived from the O.T. or from the sayings of Jesus.[3] Furthermore, there are more than sixty cases of hapax-legomena.

Thirdly, some of the parallels shared by the Epistles concerned are casual; some seem to be dependent upon the stereotyped forms, usages and the way of teaching which had been current in the primitive Christian circle.[4]

The close affinities between I Peter on the one hand and Romans and Ephesians on the other exclude, so it seems to Weiss, the possibility of independence of one from the other; and Weiss understands these affinities in terms of

---

[1] E.g., δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως, ἐξ ἔργου, πρόθεσις, προοριζεῖν, καταλλασσεῖν, υἱοθεσία, ἀπολύτρωσις, θάνατος, ὑπομονή, μυστήριον, γνῶσις, πλήρωμα, ἔργα τοῦ νόμου, σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

[2]

Paul	I Peter
σάρξ – πνεῦμα (or νοῦς)	σάρξ – ψυχή
temple = ναός	οἶκος
σταυρός	ξύλον
φίλημα ἁγιόν	φίλημα ἀγάπης
τὸ λοιπόν	τὸ τέλος
χρυσός	χρυσίον
πραότης	πραΰτης
μέλει μοῖ τινος	μέλει μοῖ περί τινος

[3] Weiss, op. cit., p. 389.

[4] Ibid., pp. 397-398. Weiss regards the parallel doxologies as having been originated in the 'liturgical practice of the primitive Christian community' (Ibid., pp. 401ff.).

the dependence of the other two epistles upon I Peter. Weiss tries to substantiate this view by appealing to his reconstruction of the situation of the early Church on the basis of the following twofold observation: on the one hand, the addressees of I Peter were, in his view, solely composed of Jewish Christians; on the other hand, there is a marked absence of any reference to the issue of the observance of the Law[1] in our Epistle. This latter point suggests, in Weiss's view, the date of writing prior to the third missionary journey of Paul, i.e., prior to the Apostolic Council.[2] Since the writing of Romans and Ephesians supposedly took place after the Apostolic Council, the only legitimate conclusion to be drawn is, in Weiss's view, the dependence of Romans and Ephesians upon I Peter.

Weiss's method of evaluating the literary relations and his reconstruction of the situation are intricately tied up with the dogmatic-apologetic premise by which he understands the task of Biblical study.[3] Weiss seems to regard himself as rendering service to the life of the Church by affirming the authenticity of I Peter, though without clarifying how, and in what sense, the affirmation is equated with the rendering of service. When one sees that Weiss's affirmation of the Petrine authenticity and priority is made at the cost of Pauline authenticity, one would be certainly tempted to raise the question of whether he renders, in fact, a disservice to the Church by denying, by implication, the Pauline priority. No relevant answer can be expected, so it seems, from Weiss's rather naive dogmatic-apologetic position.

---

[1] Cf. ibid., pp. 144-159.

[2] Weiss goes further to specify the date of writing in the first year of the reign of Nero (A.D. 54). Ibid., p. 364.

[3] ". . . Es will mir scheinen, als ob gerade die Herausarbeitung der einzelnen neutestamentlichen Lehrtropen nicht etwa nur ein Spiel wissenschaftlichen Witzes oder ein Supplement zum historische Verständnis christlicher Lehrentwicklung, sondern ganz besonders dazu geeignet ist, in den vollen Reichtum der trotz ihrer inneren Einheit doch so vielgestaltigen Schriftwahrheit einzuführen." (Lehrbegriff, pp. vii-viii.)

Thus it seems to be unnecessary to wait for Baur's criticism[1] to point out difficulties with Weiss's solution to the literary[2] and historical[3] problems. A fatal

---

[1] F. C. Bauer, "Der erste petrinische Brief," Theologische Jahrbuch, 1856, pp. 193-240. Cf. also his Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Verlag und Druck von L. Fr. Fues, 1863), pp. 230ff.

[2] Weiss does not provide us with any cogent exegetical explanation as to the Petrine priority on relevant passages. On this point our criticism of the views of the Pauline priority, which we will present later, seems to be also pertinent.

[3] For instance, Weiss does not take into account the plausibility of the existence of Gentile Christians and their incorporation into the Christian churches in Asia Minor in the first decades of the expansion of Christianity. In this regard Weiss's understanding, e.g., of I Ptr. 1:1 is, as Baur notes ("Der erste petrinische Brief," p. 210), too literal.

Furthermore, even if we agree with Weiss in postulating that our Epistle was written ca. A.D. 54 in order to account for the absence of any reference to the observance of the Law, the date of writing comes after the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10:1ff.) in which Peter had had a special part. Weiss certainly would not have doubted the problem involved in Weiss's study seems to be in his relating the assumption of the existence of an authentic writing originating with Peter the Apostle with the avowed dogmatic-apologetic interest; in this way Weiss seems to have failed to do full justice to the integrity of Biblical study as the critical examination of the historico-literary problems presented in the text. Baur seems to be quite right in directing his criticism at this point.[1]

(ii) E. Kühl

The outlook reflected in Kühl's introduction to I Peter[2] is basically the same as that of his teacher B. Weiss, except for a stricter application of grammatical consideration in his assessing the meaning, e.g., of 1:1. The explicit dogmatic-apologetic interest, which marked Weiss's work, seems to disappear in Kühl's. The latter is, however, in line with Weiss, first, in his emphatically clarifying the O.T. background of the motifs in I Peter, and secondly, in his indicating the possibility that not a few of the alleged literary points of contact may have been derived from the sources or expressions

---

historicity of this incident (cf. Baur, "Der erste petrinische Brief," pp. 201ff.).

[1] Baur, "Der erste petrinische Brief," p. 240. Also pp. 193-194.

[2] J. E. Huther-E. Kühl, Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den 1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas und den 2. Brief des Petrus (KEK, 5th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1887).

current in the early Christian churches. In relation to the second point, Kühl maintains that some of the words in I Peter enumerated by Holtzmann as characteristically Pauline (e.g., καλεῖν, κληρονομία, χαρίσματα) do not belong to the specifically Pauline terminology, but "are originated in the ideas based upon the apostolic consciousness."[1] Kühl rejects the view that regards the epistolary form shared by I Peter and Ephesians alike as characteristically Pauline, since the view is, in Kühl's view, based upon an unlikely assumption that the form was first created and promulgated by Paul in the early Church.[2] While in agreement with Weiss in his maintaining the priority of I Peter over against Ephesians, Kühl differs from his teacher in his suggesting the possibility that the author of I Peter may have read Romans, though he denies the dependence of the former upon the latter. In the case of the relation to James, Kühl accepts Beyschlag's view[3] that James is the oldest document in the Christian church, and concludes a dependence on the side of I Peter without any detailed discussion.

As regards the Petrine priority Kühl does not present, like Weiss, any convincing exegetical basis for his argument. Despite notable observation on some issues

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 43. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 47. A reference is made to Beyschlag, *Commentar Jakobusbrief*, p. 36.

(e.g., on the relation between I Peter and the Pauline epistles) Kühl's view as a whole seems to have not contributed much to clarify the nature and extent of literary affinities.

(iii) E. Scharfe

Scharfe's work[1] is intended to confirm the literary originality of the 'Petrine corpus', i.e., I Peter, Mark and the Petrine speeches in Acts. His method is twofold: 1) the first is a comparative analysis of the literary characteristics of the corpus; with this method he tries to prove that a 'graphic-concrete manner of speech' marks the corpus; the use of words is distinctly dependent upon the LXX. He attributes certain characteristics to the fact that the corpus originated with an eye-witness to the life of Jesus.

2) The second is an analysis of the way of thinking represented in the corpus. Scharfe considers that a notable feature of this way of thinking is that the Apostle Peter, whom he regards as standing behind the corpus, recognized the soteriological significance in the historical events and facts which he himself had experienced with Jesus.

The result of the study based upon his twofold method leads Scharfe to see Peter's unique place in the history of the early Church, first, as the reliable informant of the Christian tradition; secondly, as the supervisor of the proclamation of the Gospel message in the days of the original Apostles, and thirdly, as the authoritative bearer of the Gospel tradition.

---

[1] *Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur* (Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Richard, 1893).

Scharfe's attempt to establish organic relations in the Petrine corpus itself is a notable one.[1] However, in dealing with Mark and the Petrine speeches as unified entities of traditions which originated with the Apostle himself serious questions arise concerning source analysis,[2] form criticism,[3] and history-of-redaction study.[4] Furthermore, his view of I Peter retains certain problems.[1] As a whole, therefore, Scharfe's study needs to be fully re-examined.

---

[1] A renewed interest in this direction may be seen, e.g., in: Manfred Karnetzki, "Die galiläische Redaktion im Markus-evangelium," ZNW, 52 (1961), 238-272; esp. 271.

[2] Cf. e.g., V. Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959), pp. 67-77; and 653-664.

[3] Cf. e.g., M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck --, 1959); R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

Also M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of Apostles, ed. H. Greeven, E.t. M. Ling and P. Schubert (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 102-108 and 138-185.

[4] Cf. e.g., W. Marxen, Der Evangelist Markus (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959). Also H. Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit (4th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1962); G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, H. J. Held, Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthaus-Evangelium (2nd ed.; Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961).

(iv) C. Bigg

Bigg[2] deals with the problem of literary relations by asking, to 'what books of the N.T. I Peter bears any resemblance, and what is the extent and nature of the resemblance.' Although convinced that the Apostle Peter, whom he regards as the one who commissioned and authenticated the writing 'through Silvanus,' had read several of Paul's epistles, Bigg concludes that Peter's previous acquaintance with Paul's writings did not leave any notable trace of slavish imitation on our Epistle.[3] In his view the alleged similarities represent noting else than the 'current commonplace,' or the 'pulpit formulae of the time.' As for the rest of the N.T. writings, James suggests the existence of a 'positive literary connection' between itself and I Peter; in this case Bigg sides with Grimm, Holtzmann, Brückner, Weiss, Usteri and others in accepting the priority of I Peter. In the cases of Hebrews and Revelation Bigg regards the affinities as implying either their common derivation from the 'same school of thought' (Heb.) or the similarities of the minds of the authors (Rev.). With regard to the Gospel traditions Bigg referes to Von Soden who noted in I Peter 'a number of allusions to the Gospels in some pre-canonical shape.' Bigg thinks that the parallels in Luke show the 'nearest resemblance' to I Peter. In concluding his survey Bigg maintains that the literary features (i.e., style, vocabulary, phraseology) do not offer "any conclusive evidence of either the absolute or relative date of I Peter."[1]

---

[1] Scharfe thinks that close dependence upon the LXX marks the language and motifs of I Peter. However, this dependence is also apparent and extensive in the rest of the N.T. Scharfe fails to make clear how he evaluates the latter fact or whether he sees a difference in degree of dependence in I Peter and the rest of the N.T.

2) He refers to I Peter 2:22-24 as one of the strong indications of the fact that the author was an eye-witness of Jesus. The language of the passage is in a close parallel with that of Isa. 53 to the degree that it seems inevitable to conclude that the passage has taken over the language of the Isaian passage.

3) It seems questionalbe whether we can, with Scharfe, attribute the origin of the 'way of observation,' seeing the soteriological significance in the events and facts related to Jesus, to the Apostle alone.

4) Scharfe refers to the ἀνά-composition as one of the notable literary features of our Epistle (*op. cit.*, p. 11). But one can enumerate in the N.T. no less than sixty ἀνά-compositions with numerous instances which do not appear in I Peter!

[2] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901).

[3] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 16-20.

Although his view in particular that the alleged similarities shared both by I Peter and the Pauline epistles would represent the 'current commonplace' appears to be as precursory to the subsequent form-critical observation, Bigg's survey remains basically an enumeration of more or less probable points of contacts without adequate exegetical examination. Bigg's study, therefore, fails to present itself with due persuasiveness.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

(v) Concluding Remarks

The cases presented by the four scholars in favour of the Petrine independence or priority in their evaluating of the 'literary points of contact,' or literary affinities, differ from each other as regards the premise, extent of exegetical examination and the final outcome. The position represented by these scholars can hardly be called the consensus of the 'conservative' scholarship, since Zahn, a noted conservative, comes out with a view in favour of the Petrine dependence especially upon Romans and Ephesians.[1] We may render an evaluation of their position in the history of research on our Epistle on the following two points:

First, the view that a mere enumeration of the apparent literary affinities does not prove any literary relationship at all between the writings concerned (Weiss, Kuhl), basically holds true. This point would have been a sound corrective to the 'critical' view that affirms the Petrine dependence if it had shown itself to be exegetically justified.

Secondly, their attempt to explain the affinities of the 'literary points of contact' in terms of their common derivation from a common stock of phrases and motifs utilized in various ways in the early Church (Weiss, Kühl, Bigg) seems to have been a pertinent one in assessing the nature of the affinities, since it appears to have been aware of the possibility that the affinities may well be explained, at least in part, in terms of their rootage in various expressions of the communal life of the early Church. In this sense, their attempt may be regarded as anticipatory of the form-critical approach. Unfortunately, their attempt did not have a sound methodological basis as did the one schematized later into the form-critical method; and so, the attempt left the impression of being too casual to become the object of exegetical scrutiny.

---

[1] Theodor Zahn, Einleitung in das N.T. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf., 1900), II, 36ff.

SECTION 2

The Views That Affirm the Petrine Dependence

(i) Preliminary Remarks

The history of the views that see the 'literary points of contact' mainly in terms of dependence on the side of I Peter is virtually as old as the view that denies the Petrine authorship of the Epistle. According to Weiss, who gives a convenient summary of the critical views held prior to him,[1] Semler maintained as early as 1781 that I Peter had imitated the Pauline epistles.

---

[1] B. Weiss, Der petrinische Lehrbegriff, esp. pp. 375ff. Cf. J. E. Huther-E. Kühl, op. cit., pp. 10ff.

Semler was followed, so Weiss informs us, by such scholars as J. D. Michaelis, Schulze, J. G. Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Schott, Steiger, Credner de Wette and others. Following the rather extended review of Weiss's Lehrbegriff by Baur,[1] the view has been maintained by a host of scholars up to the most recent time.[2] When Goodspeed made the following statement he seems to have well expressed the common conviction of these scholars:

---

[1] F. C. Baur, "Der erste petrinische Brief," pp. 193-240.

[2] E.g., G. H. Ewald, Sieben Sendschreiben des Neues Bundes (Göttingen: Dietrichschen Buchhandlung, 1870), pp. 4-6. W. Seufert, "Die Abhängigkeit des 1. Ptr. vom Römerbrief," Zwt (1874), 360-388. J. M. Usteri, Wissenschaftlicher und praktischer Commentar über den Ersten Petrusbrief (Zürich: S. Hohr, 1887), Part II, pp. 279-335. H. J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das N.T. (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck, 1892), esp. pp. 313-315. W. M. Ramsey, The Church in the Roman Empire (3rd ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894), p. 286. W. Sanday-A. C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), pp. lxxiv-lxxvi. A. von Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrisch'sche Buchhandlung, 1897), I, 451-465; esp. 452-453. A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (revised ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), pp. 482-487; esp. pp. 485ff. J. J. A. Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan & Co., 1898), pp. 4-5. Hans von Soden, Hebraerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas (HCNT; Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck, 1899), p. 116. T. Zahn, Einleitung in das N.T. (2nd ed.; Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf., 1900), II, 30-31; and 36-38. W. Wrede, "Bemerkungen zu Harnacks Hypothese über die Adresse 1. Petrusbriefs," ZNW, I (1900), 75-85. F. H. Chase, "Peter, First Epistle of," in HDB, III (1906), 779-796; esp. 788-789. H. Gunkel, Der erste Brief des Petrus (SNT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907), II, 25-60; esp. 26-27. R. Knopf, Die Briefe Petri und Judae (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912), pp. 6-9. Paul Feine, Einleitung in das N.T. (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1913), pp. 97-103; esp. pp. 99-101. O. D. Foster, The Literary Relations of 'The First Epistle of Peter,' passim. G. W. Blenkin, The First Epistle General of Peter, esp. pp. lx-lxviii. Eduard Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche

---

Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1923), III, 606-612; esp. 606. E. J. Goodspeed, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927), *passim*. J. Moffatt, *The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Jude* (*MNTC*; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928), pp. 85-86. (Only the Petrine acquaintance with the Pauline epistles is, as in his Introduction, affirmed.) B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1929), pp. 121-141; esp. p. 132. Arnold Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes* (Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1930), pp. 72-82. P. Feine-J. Behm, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (8th ed.; Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1936), p. 238. E. Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1937), esp. pp. 10-12. M. S. Enslin, *The Literature of the Christian Movement*, Part III of his *Christian Beginnings* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1938), pp. 321-326; esp. pp. 322-324 (page references made to the Cloister Library edition, 1956). A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes A Literary Influence*, pp. 51-68. F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 1946, pp. 9-10, 25-26 and *passim* (page references made to the 2nd edition, 1958). M. Goguel, *La Naissance du Christianisme* (Paris: Payot, 1946), esp. pp. 368-371. R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," *CN*, XI (1947), esp. 6. R. Knopf-H. Lietzmann-H. Weinel, *Einführung in das N.T.* (5th ed.; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1949), pp. 97-98. E. Schweizer, *Der erste Petrusbrief* (2nd ed.; *Prophezei* series; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949), p. 3. M. Goguel, "La second génération chretienne," *RHR*, CXXXVI (1949), esp. 200-202. C. L. Mitton, "The Relationship between 1. Peter and Ephesians," *JTS*, n.s. 1 (1950), 67-73. A. H. McNeile-C. S. C. Williams, *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* (2nd ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), esp. p. 216. C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 176-197. W. Michaelis, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (2nd ed.; Bern: Berchthold Haller Verlag, 1954), p. 286. F. Hauck, *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes* (*NTD*, 8th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 35. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des N.Ts.* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1958), p. 532. J. Schneider, *Die Kirchenbriefe* (*NTD*, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), p. 40. E. Fascher, "Petrusbriefe," (*RGG*, 3rd ed.; 1961), III, 257ff. K. H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe; der Judasbrief* (*HTKNT*; Basel/Freiburg/Wien: Herder, 1961), pp. 5-6.

Cf. James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918), esp. pp. 329-331. (". . . While an acquaintance not only

> No method in literary study is more objective or more fruitful than the comparison of one work with another to determine the question of literary indebtedness--which one shows acquaintance with the other, use of it, and dependence upon it.[1]

---

with the general conceptions, but also with one or two of the epistles of Paul . . . is indubitable, the writer is by no means a Paulinist. His attitude is rather that of the common practical consciousness pervading the churches." pp. 330-331.) J. Michl, *Der Brief an die Habraer und die Katholischen Briefe* (Vol. VIII of *Das Neue Testament* series; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1953), pp. 193-230; esp. p. 194 ("Die Verwandtschaft zu Röm und Eph lässt eine literarische Verbindung mit diesen Briefen nicht erkennen."). Also Feine-Behm-Kümmel, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (13th ed.; Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1964), pp. 303-310; esp. 308 ("1. Pt. setzt die paulinische Theologie voraus. . . . Zwar ist die immer wieder vertretene Annahme einer literarischen Abhängigkeit des 1. Pt. vom Röm. . . . unwahrscheinlich . . .).

[1] In the foreword by E. J. Goodspeed to Barnett, *op. cit.*, p. vii. Cf. B. W. Bacon's introduction to the work by Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 367-369.

As to possible literary-critical principles which would seem underlying the view to take literary affinities as indicative of literary dependence, see E. De Witt Burton, *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1904). Also W. R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem* (New York: The Macmillan Co./London: Collier-Macmillan, Ltd., 1964), esp. pp. 199-232.

The works by Burton and Farmer (limiting ourselves to the pages indicated above) are the only two attempts known to the present writer to systematize principles as to our judging on the literary priority. In this regard, while their attempts are made primarily in connection with the Synoptic problem, the implication and applicability of the attempts seems to be more far-reaching than the two scholars primarily intended. Of these two attempts, Burton's study seems to be preferable, and one will be able to draw pertinent suggestions from his careful schematic presentation and remarks. Farmer's presentation appears to be over-simplified especially with regard to the literary character of the Synoptic gospels.

Now, the principles formulated by Burton are, for the most part (i.e., except first two general principles), concerned with a literary relationship of a documentary (as versus'oral') character. Burton notes, as to the form of tradition underlying the present written Gospels, that "(literary) resemblances . . . produced by oral relationship" may have constituted one of the important strata

Despite a large number of the scholars who subscribe to the view that affirms the Petrine dependence, first, only a few of them have actually presented their case with a more or less detailed exegetical examination of the instances; among the few one may name Baur, Seuffert, Usteri, Zahn, Knopf, Moffatt, Foster, Barnett and Mitton.[1] The rest of them, as typified by Holtzmann's presentation,[2] are limited merely to a listing of literary

---

(*op. cit.*, pp. 4-5); however, this stratum of literary affinities is out of Burton's consideration in his formulating the principles. In relation with I Peter and anticipating form-critical studies (as well as critical remarks as made e.g., by Beare), we will limit ourselves to stating that various forms of non-documentary stratum may be constituting an important factor for a proper examination of assessment of literary affinities. It seems more than plausible that this type of stratum of tradition was, along with the documentary one, formulated, used and transmitted in the actual course of worshipping and evangelizing life of the early Church; one may well presume that there are, in the N.T., traces of both strata of tradition, documentary and non-documentary. If the issue of literary priority is judged only on the basis of documentary evidence (by assuming at least implicitly that early Christian literary products might have formed a documentary series), such an undertaking may not be doing full justice to the complexity and variety of the traditional material (*Traditionsstoffe*) underlying the N.T.

[1] To these we may add Jean Monnier, *La Première Epître de L'Apôtre Pierre* (thèse présentee a la Faculté de Théologie protestante de Paris; Macon: Protat Frères, 1900), esp. pp. 259-274. Monnier's study has come into my hand only after I completed the survey of the position with which we are concerned at present. His study does not appear to be altering substantially my evaluation of the position.

[2] Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritische Einleitung in das N.T.*, pp. 313-315.

similarities. Secondly, the differences among these scholars are limited to the enumeration of possible parallels or defining the extent of them; so far as we can see, there are few substantial differences or traces of development as to the premise, method or outcome of the studies as we find, for instance, among various form-critical approaches.[1]

In this section we shall limit ourselves to surveying the case presented by Mitton, since this appears to be one of the best ways to illustrate the position held by these scholars. Mitton's study, first, appears to be one of the sober attempts to elucidate the nature and extent of the literary affinities. Secondly, Mitton's study is of a relatively recent date, and this is another factor that has led us to take up his study. Mitton's study is, so to speak, 'post-form criticism,'[2] and this may give us a chance to ask, whether, as regards some instances of affinities, there would be a better way of explicating them in the light of form-critical studies on the writings concerned.

---

[1] See Excursus.

[2] By 'post-form criticism' we mean a period of research contemporaneous with various attempts of applying form-critical premise and method on the N.T. Dibelius's article, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.--ausserhalb der Evangelien--," TR N.F. 3 (1933), 207-242, serves as a convenient summary of various form-critical studies up to that date.

Among the pre-form-critical scholars, Usteri may be commended for his careful handling of the exegetical problems as regards the affinities. In this regard, we are in agreement with Beare who seems to express a higher evaluation of Usteri's work than of those by Foster and Barnett (Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 9, fn. 1).

Different from the primarily descriptive survey of various studies in Section 1 and 3, what we intend to do now is a critical examination, in somewhat detailed form, the case presented by Mitton. This is because, first, we are aware that the position represented by Mitton and others has maintained a dominant place in the course of the assessment of Petrine literary affinities, and secondly, it seems that the exegetical bases adduced in favour of this position would be in need of a serious re-examination. It would suffice our immediate concern if the problematical nature of the exegetical grounds would be exposed by the study we are about to undertake.

Before we go into an actual survey, let us see briefly from what viewpoint Mitton presents his case. Mitton takes up the literary affinities, which I Peter shares with Ephesians, out of his concern to determine the date of Ephesians. He thinks that the literary affinities that the Revelation, the Pastoral epistles, Acts and I Peter share with Ephesians may be taken (like those in the Church Fathers and the Apostolic Fathers) as indicative of the acquaintance of these writings with Ephesians; and, if the date of these writings may be ascertained, the literary affinities would have a significant bearing upon determining that of Ephesians.

Mitton is well aware of the fact that the date and authorship of I Peter are, like those of Acts, open questions, and in view of the uncertainty the evidence of literary affinities adduced from I Peter is "elusive and problematical."[1] Nevertheless, Mitton hopes that a proper handling of the instances may ascertain a relationship of acquaintance, or a direct literary dependence, of I Peter with Ephesians. He seems to assume an inherent validity of a normal (or primary) exegetical procedure (i.e., an examination of the statistical data and meaning of words, phrases; a context-analytical consideration; an examination of history-of-concept parallels),[2] with a probable exception of an implicit assumption which underlies his comparative examination of parallels, found in Colossians, Ephesians and I Peter (we shall return to this assumption at a pertinent point of our study). This would mean that our examination of the case presented by Mitton may be carried out largely along the lines of a normal exegetical procedure, with an exception of our taking the form-critical possibilities into consideration.[3]

---

[1] Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 170.

[2] Cf. W. G. Kümmel, "Die neutestamentliche Exegese," in Einführung in die exegetischen Methoden (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1964), pp. 37-67.

[3] Cf. Otto Kaiser, "Die alttestamentliche Exegese," in Einführung in die exegetischen Methoden, esp., pp. 19-24. Kaiser devotes there a chapter to the subject, "Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Analyse," which does not, by the way, appear in Kümmel's article on N.T. exegesis which we have mentioned above; fn. 2.

The steps to be taken in our survey of Mitton's study will be as follows: at first, we will take up the words and phrases which suggest to him a literary relationship between I Peter and Ephesians; then we will survey a few passages, concerning which Mitton is in agreement with a concensus of opinion by the representative scholars (e.g., Baur, Usteri, Foster) in terms of the passages' being the evidence of a direct literary relationship between the writings concerned. Our survey of the case will be accompanied either by our remarks to note difficulties, if there are any, with his presentation of the case or by our suggestions of possible alternatives to explicate the affinities. In the 'Concluding Remarks' we shall try to sum up the problem as regards Mitton's presentation of the case.

(ii) Examination of Parallel Words and Phrases Presented by Mitton

Mitton lists εὔσπλαγχνος (I Ptr. 3:8; Eph. 4:32) and ἀκρογωνιαῖος (I Ptr. 2:6; Eph. 2:20) as the words which appear only in these two writings of the N.T.

Ἀκρογωνιαῖος, one of the two words, appears, in I Ptr. 2:6, in a quotation of Isa. 28:16 (LXX). Two problems may be noted: 1) is it probable that the Petrine writer is reminded of the Isaiah passage by the

Ephesian use of ἀκρογωνιαῖος ?[1] Even if it is the case, one may have to presume, so it seems, that ἀκρογωνιαῖος was a word so well known to the Petrine writer that his notice of the word in the Ephesians passage led him to recite Isa. 28:16, though the Isaiah passage was not explicitly quoted in the Ephesians passage. Then one would have to account why the Petrine writer could easily associate ἀκρογωνιαῖος with Isa. 28:16 while assuming Petrine dependence upon Eph. 2:20. 2) Isa. 28:16 appears, as part of a conflated quotation, also in Rom. 9:33. Dodd notes that the differences between Rom. 9:33 and I Ptr. 2:6 are not easily reconcilable with assuming the latter's dependence upon the former, and suggests that these two passages are independently drawing upon a (different versions of) testimonial piece current in the early Church.[2] Even if one assumes, contrary to Dodd's suggestion, the Petrine dependence upon Rom. 9:33 (in this case, the absence of ἀκρογωνιαῖος from Rom. 9:33 is to be accounted for), this assumption would lead one to see another possibility, i.e., the use of ἀκρογωνιαῖος in a quotation of Isa. 28:16 would be also explicable in terms of the Petrine dependence upon Rom. 9:33; then the possibility of dependence would not be limited to Eph. 2:20.

---

[1] If Isa. 28:16 is quoted in the Ephesians passage, and I Peter is using ἀκρογωνιαῖος alone, the probability would be enhanced (cf. Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), pp. 438-439. Since it is otherwise, the burden of proof--in the sense of presenting a cogent exegetical rationale--seems to be on the one who affirms the probability.

[2] C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), pp. 42-43.

How does Mitton explain these problems about ἀκρογωνιαῖος ?

Mitton lists one phrase and various words which are used, in his terms, "in some of the late books of the N.T., but not in the other Pauline epistles, nor in Mark"; they are as follows:

πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (I Ptr. 1:20; Eph. 1:4)
διάβολος (I Ptr. 5:8; Eph. 4:27; 6:11)
πάροικος (I Ptr. 2:11; Eph. 2:19)
ποιμήν (Eph. 4:11) and ποιμαίνω (I Ptr. 5:2)
ἄφθαρτος (I Ptr. 3:4) and ἀφθαρσία (Eph. 6:24)
περιποίησις (I Ptr. 2:9; Eph. 3:10)
ποικίλος (I Ptr. 4:10) and πολυποίκιλος (Eph. 3:10)
ἀσωτία (I Ptr. 4:4; Eph. 5:18)
ἄγνοια (I Ptr. 1:14; Eph. 4:18)
μάταιος (I Ptr. 1:18) and ματαιότης (Eph. 4:17)

Against Mitton, the following points may be noted: The phrase, πρὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ , has 1) its exact parallel in Jn. 17:24, or in one of the 'late books of the N.T.'[1] Certainly there is an intrinsic possibility of dependence on the side of a later writing upon an earlier writing. However, can we make the possibility an exegetical premise in our evaluating the literary affinities shared by any two writings of the N.T.? 2) There are history-of-concept parallels to this phrase. For instance, "before the foundation of the world" appears in *The Assumption of Moses* 1:14, which appears to be reflected in Gal. 3:19.[1] 3) There are differences in the contextual relations between the phrase in I Peter and in Ephesians. Πρὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ in I Ptr. 1:20 is applied to the foreordained election of *Christ*; in line with this meaning is Jn. 17:24, in which the same phrase refers to God's relationship in love to Christ. In Eph. 1:4 the same phrase is applied to the foreordained election of *Christians*. In order to maintain the Petrine acquaintance with, and a conscious alteration of, the Ephesian usage, at least two things would seem to be in need of clarification: first, to examine and evaluate history-of-concept, as well as within-N.T., parallels to these different usages;[2] secondly, to present an exegetical rationale to elucidate how the Petrine acquaintance and conscious alteration would be justified in view of I Peter as a whole. 4) Coutts suggests a possibility that Eph. 1:3ff. might have been modelled upon a current liturgical formula, which also underlies, so thinks Coutts, I Ptr. 1:3ff.;[1] that is, the structural similarity shared by these passages would be possibly explained in terms of their common derivation from a piece of liturgical material. How does Mitton answer this suggestion?

---

[1] There are also a few instances of ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ in the N.T. (i.e., Lk. 11:50; Heb. 4:3; 9;26; Rev. 13:8; 17:8. Cf. Matt. 13:35; 25; 34).

---

[1] Kautsch, *APAT* (1962), II, 319. Also H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (*KEK*: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 113.

[2] We shall take up this problem in a pertinent chapter of our study.

When these considerations are brought together, the probability of πρὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ being a piece of evidence in favour of the Petrine acquaintance with the same phrase in Eph. 1:4 seems to be lessened.

With regard to διάβολος, its frequent (!) use in the rest of the N.T. has to be taken into consideration.[2] The parallels in the Gospels may not be neglected, since the date of the Gospel traditions seems to be not identical with that of the written Gospels as we have them.

On πάροικος , Mitton himself admits the differences in meaning.[3] The history-of-concept parallels in the O.T. (Cf. e.g., Gen. 23:4; 26:3; 35:12) as well as the use of πάροικος in Acts 7:6 and παροικέω in Heb. 11:9

---

[1] John Coutts, "Ephesians 1:3-4 and I Peter 1:3-12," NTS, III, 115-127.

[2] E.g., Matt. 4:1, 5, 8, 11; 13:39; 25:41; Lk. 4:2, 3, 6, 13; 8:12; Jn. 6:70; Acts 10:38; I Tim. 3:6; Heb. 2:14; Jude 9, et al. Cf. Von Rad and Foerster in TWNT, III, 69-80.

[3] Πάροικος Is used in I Ptr. 2:11 "to describe what a true Christian ought to be in this world . . .," while in Eph. 2:19, the same word is "used in a bad

would have to be also taken into consideration.

Mitton says that ποιμήν in Eph. 4:11 and ποιμαίνω in I Ptr. 5:2 are used "not of Christ Himself but of Christian pastors." The following points would have to be cleared before we admit the affinity noted by Mitton: 1) Ποιμήν in I Ptr. 2:25 (!) designates, with ἐπίσκοπος, Christ. This instance seems to have been accidently overlooked by Mitton. If not, what would be an exegetical rationale of Mitton's preference of a verbal form (ποιμαίνω) to a substantival form (ποιμήν), the same form as we have in Eph. 4:11? 2) Ποιμαίνω in e.g., Jn. 21:26 and Acts 20:28 is used of the ministry of 'Christian pastors.' Mitton may be right in regarding these instances as belonging to the late N.T. books. However, the history-of-concept parallels as we find in the O.T. (cf. e.g., Ps 23:1; Isa. 40:11; Ezek. 34:11-23; 37:24; also Sirach 18:13) and the parallel instances in the N.T. to the metaphors, ποιμήν and ποιμαίνω (cf. Mk. 6:34 = Matt. 9:36. Matt. 2:6; 26:31; Jn. 10:11), would seem to lessen the weight of the argument on the basis of the alleged 'late date' of the writings concerned.

Mitton says that ἄφθαρτος (I Ptr. 3:4) and ἀφθαρσία (Eph. 6:24) "signify that is pure and

---

rather than a good sense, to describe what the Gentiles once were, before they were brought into the family of the Church." (Mitton, *op. cit.*, p. 182.)

untarnished in the moral sense, and not . . . immortal and incorruptible in a metaphysical sense." One may admit that the definition, 'metaphysical sense,' may be applied to ἀφθαρσία , e.g., in I Cor. 15:50, 53, 54. However, how does Mitton distinguish its usage in Rom. 2: 7 and II Tim. 1:10 from that in Eph. 6:24? As regards ἄφθαρτος , its usage in a 'metaphysical sense' may be found in I Ptr. 1:4 (!) and 1:23 (!).

Mitton thinks that περιποίησις in I Ptr. 2:9 and Eph. 1:14 is used in a "passive sense, meaning 'possession.'" Thus he distinguishes it from that in I Thess. 5:9 and II Thess. 2:14, where it means 'acquisition.' Against Mitton one may note as follows: περιποίησις in a passive sense appears in Heb. 10:39; the literary-theological relations between the word in the two passages concerned and in Heb. 10:39, as well as the (history-of-tradition) background of the usage in the Hebrew passage,[1] seems to be in need of a further clarification before we dismiss the usage in Hebrews as of a later date.

---

[1] Cf. Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (*KEK*; 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 242. Michel suggests that the phrase in Heb. 10:39, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς , is reminiscent of the "Hellenistic-early Christian idiomatic expression" as represented in Lk. 17:33; 21:19.

Πολυποικίλος (Eph. 3:10), listed by Mitton with ποικίλος, is a hapax-legomenon in the N.T. One may note that it would seem intrinsically possible that the Petrine writer changed the rather unusual word in the Ephesians passage to a more common term ποικίλος. However, the possibility seems to be somewhat undermined by the following observation: the word ποικίλος in I Ptr. 4:10 is used, like πολυποικίλος in Eph. 3:10, "somewhat daringly to describe an attribute of God, . . . of His Grace," but in I Ptr. 1:6 (!) the same adjective denotes, as in Jas 1:2, a variety of temptations.[1] Is this correspondence between I Ptr. 1:6 and Jas. 1:2 merely accidental?[2] At any rate, the differences in meaning between ποικίλος in I Ptr. 4:10 and that in I Ptr. 1:6 would seem to require a cogent exegetical explanation.

Mitton thinks that ἀσωτία in I Ptr. 4:4 and Eph. 5:18 is used to denote the "profligate conduct unworthy of a Christian." Against Mitton one may note as follows: in Eph. 5:18 the word is clearly related to drunkenness; but in I Ptr. 4:4 and Tit. 1:1:6 (where the word is used, in relation with the qualifications of an elder, to denote the decorous behaviour of his children) that association is absent, and is used in a general sense of a manner of conduct unseemly for a Christian, or for a member of a household of a Christian leader (cf. ἀσώτως in Lk. 15:13). Thus, first, Mitton's definition of ἀσωτία in I Ptr. 4:4 and Eph. 5:18 would seem to be too general. Secondly, the correspondence in meaning between ἀσωτία in the Petrine passage and that in Tit.1:6 seems to be in need of a further clarification.[1]

---

[1] Cf. II Tim. 3:6; Tit. 3:3; Heb. 13:9.

[2] Cf. W. Nauck, "Freude im Leiden," ZNW, XXXXVI (1955), 68-80. Nauck suggests, in accordance with Selwyn, a possibility of a reflection of a traditional persecution formula in I Ptr. 1:6; 4:13-14; Jas. 1:2, 12. The same tradition is assumed to underlie Matt. 5:11-12 and Lk. 6:22-23.

Mitton thinks that ἄγνοια in I Ptr. 1:14 and Eph. 4:18 refers to the "pre-Christian condition of unbelievers." Against Mitton's view, one may note as follows: the same use of ἄγνοια seems to be also reflected in Acts 3:17; 17:30. It seems to be difficult to reach a concensus of opinion in our assessment of the meaning[2] and the (history-of-tradition) relation of ἄγνοια in Acts to the same word in I Peter and Ephesians. It would seem possible, however, that the word belonged to a common stock of early Christian missionary terminology characterizing a man prior to conversion.

---

[1] Foerster in *TWNT*, I, 504-505. Also Anton Vögtle, *Die Tügend- und Lasterkataloge im N.T.* (Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936), pp. 104-105. S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkatalog im N.T.* (*Beihefte zur ZNW* 25; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1959) has no reference to this word.

[2] Cf. E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (*KEK*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 171 and 465.

Mitton thinks that the idea of 'vanity' in I Ptr. 1:18 and Eph. 4:17 (μάταιος in I Peter; ματαιότης in Ephesians) refers, like ἄγνοια, to the "pre-Christian condition of unbelievers." Against Mitton, one may make the following observation: μάταιος and ματαιότης are paralleled elsewhere in the N.T.[1] Among these instances especially noteworthy is μάταιος in Acts 14:15, which seems to correspond to the LXX usage denoting the quality or reality related to the 'psuedo-divine powers.'[2] Thus it would seem possible that, first, μάταιος in this sense belonged to the early Christian missionary vocabulary, and secondly, μάταιος in I Ptr. 1:18 and ματαιότης Eph. 4:17 were taken over from the vocabulary to designate the 'pre-Christian condition.'

Thus we are left with εὔσπλαγχνος alone (I Ptr. 3:8; Eph. 4:32), which, as "descriptive of Christian character," appears only at these two places in the N.T. This single instance seems hardly to amount to cumulative evidence in favour of the Petrine acquaintance or a direct literary dependence upon Ephesians. Mitton himself appears to be aware of this: he says, "Of themselves these will not carry us far in our investigation."

---

[1] Μάταιος in Acts 14:15; I Cor. 3:20 = Ps. 94:11. I Cor. 15:17; Tit. 3:9; Jas.1:26. Ματαιότης in Rom. 8:20; II Ptr. 2:18.

[2] Cf. Bauernfeind in *TWNT*, IV, esp. pp. 526-528. Also H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), pp. 211-212.

He regards them as supplying "some objective evidence for the opinions . . . that the two epistles 'breathe the same atmosphere.'"[1]

(iii) Examination of Parallel Passages Presented by Mitton

We will limit ourselves to taking up the discussion of I Ptr. 1:3 and 2:2-6.

(a) I Ptr. 1:3 and Its Parallels

By setting out the parallel passages (see the next page),[2] Mitton notes the following points:

(1) The identical use of the eleven words, which stand at the beginning of each passage, is remarkable. Unless the priority of II Corinthians is denied, the borrower of this identical wording would be I Peter.

(2) Selwyn's view of the similarity as represented in these passages as reflecting a 'common form of expression' would be underminded, so thinks Mitton, in view of the following consideration: first, unless the impossibility of I Peter's acquaintance with II Corinthians and Ephesians is assured, it is questionable whether Selwyn's view would justify the remarkable identity of the wording. Secondly, there is "insufficient evidence" that the alleged liturgical formula took its shape "within the lifetime of Paul and Peter," and this he maintains on the following grounds.

---

[1] Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 182.

[2] Ibid., p. 183. Cf. pp. 183-185.

I Ptr. 1:3	Eph. 1:3	II Cor. 1:3
εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς	εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς	εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς
καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ	καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ	καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν	κυρίου ἡμῶν	κυρίου ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,	Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,	Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ	ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς...	ὁ ...
αὐτοῦ ἔλεος		
ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς	**Eph. 2:4**	
εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν		
δι' ἀναστάσεως	ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος	
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	ὢν ἐν ἐλέει, ...	
ἐκ νεκρῶν ...	ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς	
	παραπτώμασι συν-	
	εζωοποιήσεν τῷ	
	Χριστῷ.	

---------- parts common with Ephesians and I Ptr.

———— parts common with Ephesians and II Cor.

3) The similarities between Ephesians and I Peter are "too numerous to be accidental"; for instance, first, there are syntactical similarities (the participial and relative constructions are noted) between I Ptr. 1:3-12 and Eph. 1:3-14. Secondly, the passages, which follow each one of these two passages, begin similarly (the use of διό in I Ptr. 1:13 and διὰ τοῦτο in Eph. 1:15 is noted). Thirdly, there is a 'striking coincidence' in the sequence of similarities (the appearance of such motifs as 'hope,' 'inheritance,' 'the power of God' and the 'resurrection of Christ' is noted) between I Ptr. 1:3-5 and Eph. 1:18-19. Fourthly, I Ptr. 1:3 is "substantially equivalent" to Eph. 2:4-5.

Mitton thinks that, "even if the two epistles contained no other points of coincidence," the similarities shared by the passages, surveyed above, "would make it probable that there had been some measure of interdependence, over and above familiarity with a common tradition, and that in this relationship of dependence the priority is with Ephesians."

Now, the following points would be in need of clarification before Mitton's view might be accepted:

First, the possibility to explain the 'remarkable' coincidence of the opening nine words (I Ptr. 1:3; Eph. 1:3; II Cor. 1:3) in terms of its reflecting a traditional eulogical (liturgical or epistolary)[1] formula may not after all be excluded, since the literary and history-of-concept parallels[2] to the wording would necessitate neither, as Mitton suggests, the priority of II Corinthians, nor an assumption of I Peter's acquaintance with II Corinthians and Ephesians.

Secondly, it seems unimaginable that the early Church lived in a liturgical vacuum for more than two decades (as Mitton seems to assume) without formulating even such a primary statement as a eulogical ascription. There seems to be abundant evidence in the N.T. for the fact that the early Church inherited the O.T.--Jewish liturgical forms and practices,[3] which the Church christianized, for instance, by adding Christological references. Does Mitton ascribe the formulation of the eulogical formula to Paul's literary creativity?

Thirdly, the use of the participial and relative construction in I Ptr. 1:3-12 and Eph. 1:3-14, which Mitton mentions as one of the similarities shared by the two epistles, seems to suggest the formulary style, which is also represented elsewhere in the N.T.

---

[1] Cf. N. A. Dahl, "Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes," TZ, VII (1951), 250.

[2] Cf. K. H. Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe: der Judasbrief (HTKNT; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1961), p. 27.

[3] Cf. e.g., W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925), passim; also G. Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), pp. 60-76.

Fourthly, διό in I Ptr. 1:13 and διὰ τοῦτο in Eph. 1:15 are not identical, as Mitton would also see, and the contexts of the paragraphs introduced by the inferential particle or phrase are different: διό introduces, as we shall see later, a series of exhortations,[1] while διὰ τοῦτο refers to the basis of the writer's thanksgiving for the addressees (referring both to 1:3-14 and to the participial sentence of 1:15).[2] These differences would need to be accounted for. If Mitton assumes that the differences are due to the Petrine writer's conscious alteration to meet his own different situation, what would be the exegetical rationale to substantiate his assumption in view of the rest of I Peter?

Fifthly, the alleged 'striking coincidence' in the sequence of similarities (as he sees between I Ptr. 1:3-5 and Eph. 1:18-19) would have to be looked for first between I Ptr. 1:3-12 and Eph. 1:3-14 which appears to represent a structural similarity as well as notable differences.[3] The alleged parallel in Eph. 1:18-19 is found outside a comparable contextual relation for I Ptr. 1:3-5. How does Mitton justify this contextual disparity?

---

[1] Cf. Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe, p. 44.

[2] Cf. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, p. 75.

[3] Cf. J. Coutts, "Ephesians 1:3-14 and 1. Peter 1:3-12," pp. 115-127.

Sixthly, the 'substantially equivalent' character, which Mitton adduces from I Ptr. 1:3 and Eph. 2:4-5, may well be ascribed to the passages' sharing the baptismal motifs.[1] Furthermore, the differences between these two passages would be in need of an exegetical scrutiny: for instance, the idea of Christians' being made alive with Christ' (Eph. 2:5) is found nowhere in I Peter. How is this omission explained from I Peter as a whole?

Thus it would appear that, despite Mitton's convinced view, the alleged similarities leave some difficult problems yet to be solved, and the similarities as indicated by Mitton appear to be far less cogent to prove a relationship of an interdependence between I Peter and Ephesians. As a matter of course, it would seem to be too hasty to conclude the priority of Ephesians over against I Peter on the ground of the less cogent exegetical evidence.

(b) I Ptr. 2:2-6 and Its Parallel Passages

Now we come to the second set of parallel passages as set out by Mitton (see the next page).[2] Mitton's remark on these passages may be outlined as follows:

1) In I Ptr. 2:2-6; Eph. 2:18-22 the following ideas are shared:

---

[1] Cf. e.g., Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe, pp. 27ff.; esp. pp. 28-31; also Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, pp. 109-111.

[2] Mitton, op. cit., p. 186; cf. pp. 187-188.

I Ptr. 2:6

... ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ
αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν,
εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι
χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. πρὸς
ὃν προσερχόμενοι ...
καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι
ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε
οἶκος πνευματικὸς
εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον
... ἀκρογωνιαῖον.

Eph. 2:18-22

δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν
προσαγωγὴν οἱ
ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ
πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν
πατέρα. ἄρα οὖν
οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι
καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ
... οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ,
ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ
τῷ θεμελίῳ ... ὄντες
ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ
πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει
εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν
κυρίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ
ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε
εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ
θεοῦ.

Rom. 5:2

δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν
προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν.

I Cor. 3:12

εἴ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ
ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον...
(3:16) ὁ γὰρ ναὸς
τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν,
οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς.
Cf. also Gal.6:10 and I Cor. 3:9

Col. 2:19

... ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ
σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν
καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ
συμβιβαζόμενον αὔξει
τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Col. 2:7

ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν
αὐτῷ.

——— similarities between Eph. and Pauline epistles (except Col.)
—·—·— similarities between Eph. and Col.
--------- similarities between Eph. and I Ptr.

a. The Christian's access to God through Christ;

b. the thought that privilege should lead on, in the Christian life, to some fuller experience;

c. this developing experience is represented by the figure of a house under construction, a house which is to be a holy shrine, in which the chief cornerstone is to be Christ Himself.[1]

Mitton thinks that "it would be most unusual . . . for two entirely independent writers to incorporate so many similar ideas into so short a space" even if their sharing a common life and thought in the same community might be presumed. Thus only two alternatives may be suggested, so thinks Mitton, to explain the 'unusual similarities': to assume "some measure of interdependence" or to assume "mutual dependence upon some common source."

2) On the basis of a study of a literary relationship between Colossians and Ephesians, the latter's dependence upon the former is concluded. On the basis of the general conclusion 'certain elements' in Eph. 2:18-22 and 'parts of I Ptr. 2:2-6' are derived, so Mitton maintains, from Colossians.

3) The idea of 'access to God,' found in Eph. 2:18 and I Ptr. 2:3, appears also in Rom. 5:1-2, of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

which the wording is closer to Eph. 2:18 than to I Ptr. 2:3. Ναὸς ἅγιον in Eph. 2:22 is paralleled in I Cor. 3:6 (cf. II Cor. 6:16). Eph. 2:22 is paralleled in I Cor. 3:12.

If Ephesians is written by an 'admirer of Paul,' the common features, which Ephesians shares with Paul's earlier writings, are to be assumed to have been derived from those writings, not from I Peter.

4) The 'subject-matter' of Eph. 2:18-22 is, so Mitton admits, "of the kind that might be used for didactic and liturgical purpose," but this explanation is precluded, so Mitton thinks, by the literary relationship among Ephesians, Colossians and the other Pauline writings.

Now, the following points may be noted against Mitton:

First, the problematical nature of Mitton's view on these passages would seem to be already apparent in his defining and quoting the parallel passages: that is, while he is concerned with I Ptr. 2:2-6, he sparingly quotes the passage. This manner of quotation conceals an important fact that, in I Ptr. 2:6, an explicit quotation of Isa. 28:16 (LXX) stands with a notable formula of introducing a quotation (διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ).[1] A partial reflection of the Isaiah passage may also be detected in 2:4 (λίθον . . . ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον). Terminological and conceptual similarities shared by Petrine and Ephesian passages (e.g., ἀκρογωνιαῖος; the imagery of the sacred edifice) may be, in part at least, explained in terms of their derivation from, or playing upon, the Isaiah passage. What we have in I Ptr. 2:2-6 appears to be a running commentary about ὁ κύριος (vs. 3), by utilizing or quoting Isa. 28:16 and by referring rather freely to various designations of the status of Christians (vs. 5). The same Isa. 28:16 is quoted (with a possible or probable reflection of Isa. 8:14) explicitly in Rom. 9:(32-)33.[1] Since Mitton is concerned with I Ptr. 2:2-6 as a whole, the quotation in Rom. 9:(32-)33 must not be neglected for a proper examination of words and concepts in the Petrine passage. However, in relation with his examination of the Petrine passage, Mitton refers nowhere to this Romans passage. Is his neglect of the presence of a quotation of Isa. 28:16 in I Ptr. 2:6 (and a partial reflection in 2:4) and of its parallel in Rom. 9:(32-)33 merely an accidental overlooking on Mitton's part? Or, if the definition and the sparing quotation of the Petrine passage is a deliberate one, what exegetical rationale does Mitton present for his neglecting the two important facts about the passage concerned?

---

[1] Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "The use of explicit O.T. quotations in Qumran literature and in the N.T.." NTS, VII (1960-61), 297-333; esp. 301.

---

[1] Cf. Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*KEK*, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 220; also Karl Herman Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe: der Judasbrief* (*HTKNT*; Freiburg/Basal/Wien: Herder, 1961), pp. 60-63.

We have already referred, in relation with our study of ἀκρογωνιαῖος (I Ptr. 2:6; Eph. 2:20), to Dodd's view that I Ptr. 2: (4 and) 6, 7-8 and Rom. 9:(32-)33 reflect a piece of the traditional testimonia. Since, as Dodd thinks, the differences between these passages would seem to prevent one from assuming a relationship of direct literary dependence between them, it would seem possible, to say the least, that the common features shared by the two passages are indicative of some kind of dependence upon the (different versions of) testimonial commonplace. If this line of explanation may claim a certain degree of plausibility, the propositions set out by Mitton would seem to be (considerably) undermined.

Secondly, a detailed examination of the parallels as presented by Mitton would seem to reveal some difficulties:

1) Ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε in Ptr. 2:2 is underlined as (probably) being parallel to ἐν ᾧ . . . αὔξει in Eph. 2:21. This parallel would not stand, since αὐτῷ of the former phrase refers to γάλα (I Ptr. 2:2), while the antecedent of ᾧ of the latter refers to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

2) The object, to which 'growing' is directed is, in I Peter, 'salvation' (εἰς σωτηρίαν), while that of the Ephesians passage is the 'temple' (εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον).

3) Ἀκρογωνιαῖος in I Ptr. 2:6 is singled out as a parallel to the same word in Eph. 2:20. The word in the former passage is part of an explicit quotation as we have already noted, and seems not to correspond exactly to the context of Eph. 2:20.

4) The alleged parallels between πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι (I Ptr. 2:3) and δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν (Eph. 2:18) or δι᾽ οὗ . . . τὴν προσαγωγήν (Rom. 5:2) would not stand. The relative pronoun in the Petrine phrase (ὃν) refers to ὁ κύριος = Christ, i.e., the immediate object of motion toward; in the two other phrases Christ is designated as a mediator through whom Christians have access to God (Eph.) or obtain grace (Rom.).[1]

5) A parallel between πάροικοι (Eph. 2:19) and οἰκοδομεῖσθε (I Ptr. 2:5) as suggested by Mitton does not stand, since they differ in meaning and context, while admittedly they are cognate words.

As regards these five points, it seems still possible to maintain that the differences, which I Peter shows from the parallel passages, are due to the Petrine writer's conscious alteration of the original meaning and the contextual relationships. Mitton does not provide us, so far as we can see, with any explanation of this possibility of 'conscious alteration.'

---

[1] Cf. Jn. 14:6; Heb. 10:10-12.

In short, Mitton's presentation of I Ptr. 2:2-6 and its parallel passages would seem to be far from convincing to explain the similarities shared by these passages as suggesting a sort of interdependence. As a matter of course, the alleged direct literary dependence upon the Pauline (or deutero-Pauline) passages seems not to be proved.

(iv) Concluding Remarks

Although the cases we have dealt with are not exhaustive,[1] it is hoped that they will sufficiently

---

[1] Besides the words, phrases and passages surveyed above, Mitton deals with I Ptr. 1:10-12 (Eph. 3:2-6; Col. 1:26-27); 3:22 (Eph. 1:20-21; Col. 2:12; 3:1; 1:16) and the 'ethical sections,' which in part coincide with the so-called '*Haustafel*.'

As to I Ptr. 1:10-12 and its parallels (Eph. 3:2-6; Col. 1:26-27), we may note the following: 1) differences between Eph. 3:2-6 and Col. 1:26-27 do not seem to be easily reconciled as Mitton seems to assume.(Mitton, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-186. Cf. pp. 89-91). Μυστήριον in Col. 1:26-27 (2:2; 4:3) refers, in Dibelius's terms, to 'the eschatological-mystical secret of Christ' (M. Dibelius--H. Greeven, *An die Kolosser, Epheser: an Philemon*, *HNT*, 3rd ed.; J.C. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953, p. 84), while the same word in Eph. 3:3ff. (cf. 1:9; 3:9ff.) is related with an acceptance of Gentiles (Dibelius--Greeven, *loc. cit.*). 2) There are certain terminological and context-analytical differences between I Ptr. 1:10ff. and Eph. 3:2ff. These differences seem to be in need of clarification before assuming a literary dependence among these passages, though we do note, with Mitton, that there is a similarity in the contrast of 'the hidden' and 'the revealed.'

As to I Ptr. 3:22 and its parallels (Eph. 1:20-21; Col. 2:12; 3:1; 1:16), we may note the following: 1) As to the supernatural orders, parallels in I Cor. 15:24; Rom. 8:38; Phil. 2:10, as well as parallels in Ephesians (3:10; 4:12) and Colossians (1:16; 2:15; 2:10) are to be taken into consideration. On these parallels, see Oscar Cullmann, *Königsherrschaft Christi und Kirche im N.T.* (*Theologische Studien* 10; Zollikon/Zürich: Evangelische Verlag, 1950), p. 5 and *passim*; and Heinrich illustrate how the parallels are presented by Mitton and where the problems are in their presentation.

Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the N.T.* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961), p. 7 and *passim*. 2) The idea of Christ's subjugation of the supernatural orders and His sitting at the right hand of God seems to correspond to Christological interpretation of Ps. 8:4-6 and 109:1 (LXX), respectively. It seems possible that these two O.T. passages were among the testimonial passages current in the early Church (see C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, London: Nisbet & Co., 1952, pp. 32-34 and 34-35). These problems seem to be in need of clarification.

The remaining passages are as follows:

I Ptr. 2:1	Eph. 4:25, 31	Col. 3:8
" 2:18	" 4:5	" 3:22
" 3:1	" 5:22	" 3:18
" 3:7	" 5:25	" 3:19
" (4:12)	" (6:4)	" (3:21)
" 5:5	" 5:21; 6:1	" 3:20

These passages coincide, for the most part, with specifically parenetic sections in each epistle which are customarily designated '*Haustsfel*.' The possibility of the existence of this type of unified material and possible common derivation of these passages from certain traditional parenetic material have been maintained or demonstrated by a number of scholars. We shall return to these scholars and their works when we shall survey the studies directed at the *Haustaufel*. We do not find any explicit indication that Mitton is acquainted with these studies. What Mitton owes us now is to disprove exegetically the view that the affinities shared by these parallel passages are indicative of the *Haustaufel* underlying these passages.

In view of the problematical nature of these parallel passages, which we have not examined in detail, our negative evaluation of the case presented by Mitton will not be affected substantially by them.

Mitton is notably aware of the fact that the discussion of priority as regards the 'literary dependence' between I Peter and, in Mitton's case especially, Ephesians, has been hampered by introductory presuppositions on the authenticity and date of the writings concerned.[1] Mitton's observation seems to be pertinent, since we also recognize that the introductory presuppositions have affected considerably the discussion on the literary relationships from both sides, pro and con.[2] Therefore, Mitton's proposal to 'examine the evidence with open mind' seems to be certainly a justifiable and desirable one. However, the treatment of the cases as represented by Mitton's study seems to reveal not a few problems so far as we can see from what we have surveyed in the preceding two sub-sections. The following points may be noted against the treatment as carried out by Mitton.

---

[1] Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 181.

[2] Cf. e.g., B. Weiss, Der petrinische Lehrbegriff, passim; also Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, passim; and a pertinent critical remark on Selwyn's work by Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief," ZNW, XLV (1954), 71. Lohse points out the 'unfortunate combination' of the form-critical method and the issue of authenticity in Selwyn's work. It seems to be fair to add that, despite this criticism, Lohse is affirmative in evaluating Selwyn's form-critical studies, especially with regard to the parenetic material (Lohse, op. cit., pp. 71-72).

To be compared with the studies by Weiss and Selwyn is e.g., an introduction by Foster to his own study, The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," pp. 370-380.

First, as regards some of the instances of literary affinities as set out by Mitton, a more careful and yet elementary exegetical consideration seems to have to be called forth (note our discussion, e.g., about ἀκρογωνιαῖος, πρὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ, διάβολος, ποιμήν, ἄφθαρτος, ποικίλος and of the definition and the sparing manner of quoting in 2:2-6).

Secondly, the range of the parallels seems to be unjustifiably limited. The literary affinities in I Peter are examined by Mitton only in relation with the Pauline epistles, especially with the (deutero-Pauline) Ephesians. The possible parallels with other N.T. writings are not well taken into consideration. We do note, with Beare,[1] Mitton's ingenuity in his dealing with the parallels among I Peter, Ephesians and Colossians in an article which appeared in the Journal of Theological Studies.[2] His whole line of argument, however, seems to collapse when there are parallels, e.g., in the earlier Pauline epistles, especially when dependence of the parallels upon certain early Christian Traditionsstoffe may be adduced.

Thirdly, the remark we have just made seems to be related to his implicit dual assumption: 1) that the whole complex of the history of thought of the early Church can be reduced to a mere 'history of writing' (Literaturgeschichte);[1] and 2) that the discussion of the 'literary affinities' can be entirely carried out by examining and evaluating a limited number of alleged parallels. If one can make this dual assumption, the case presented by Mitton may claim a large degree of validity to itself. But the question before us is precisely whether we are justified in making such an assumption.[2] Against the plausibility of such an assumption, it will suffice to quote a perceptive statement made by Dodd:

---

[1] F. W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter (2nd ed.), p. 195.

[2] C. L. Mitton, "The Relationship between I Peter and Ephesians," JThS, N. S. 1 (1950), 67-73.

> It [the Church] did its business in the world primarily through the medium of the living voice, in worship, teaching and missionary preaching, and out of these three forms of activity . . . liturgy, didache, kerygma . . . a tradition was built up, and this tradition lies behind all literary production of the early period, including our written gospels.[3]

---

[1] Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), p. 449. Dodd points out there an implicit assumption which seems to underlie the view which considers the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel in terms of John's using the Synoptics. The assumption articulated by Dodd ("The writings of the early Christianity must have formed a documentary series, in literary dependence on one another") and his critical remark about it seems also applicable to the particular point with which we are concerned.

We have reached this point of observation independent of Dodd's remark.

[2] The same assumption seems to underlie the views held, besides Mitton, by Bacon, Foster, Goodspeed, Barnett, Beare and others.

[3] C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), p. 8.

The following line of research, the form-critical one, is an attempt to take into account the essential features of the life-situations of the early Church as outlined by Dodd, aiming toward a better understanding of the extent and nature of the literary affinities.

SECTION 3

Form-Critical Approaches

Here we shall limit ourselves to surveying various form-critical approaches primarily in a descriptive way, since we shall give the necessary critical examination to the outcome of each approach at the pertinent point of our study. We classify the approaches in the following five categories: 1) the parenetic material (including catechism, the Haustafel, and the 'persecution form'); 2) the liturgical material (including credal formulae and hymn); 3) the baptismal discourses; 4) the baptismal liturgy, 5) the testimonia.

(i) The Parenetic Material

A. Catechism. The recognition of the existence of certain parenetic material in the N.T. antedates the development and the conscious application of form criticism upon e.g., the Synoptic Gospels.[1]

---

[1] C.f. A. Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (1903) and his Der Didache des Judentums und der Urchristenheit (1908). Also G. Klein, Der alteste christlichen Katechismus (1909). These writings were not available to the present writer. Our information

It was Carrington who developed the hypothesis maintained by Seeberg, though apparently he was independent of the latter, demonstrating that a large part of the parallels among the Pauline (and deutero-Pauline) epistles, I Peter and James, could have been traced back to a common catechetical scheme current in the Church.[1] In Carrington's view the common material in Colossians, Ephesians, I Peter and James was composed of four parts (i.e., _Deponentes_, _Subjecti_, _Vigilate_ and _Resistite_). In view of its correspondence to the 'Jewish traditional material' and the inner coherence among the parallel passages, Carrington is confident in his conclusion that a common, traditional Christian catechetical scheme underlay the alleged parallel passages, and also in his rejection of the view that takes the parallels as evidence for literary dependence among the writings. One of the notable features of Carrington's study, especially with regard to I Peter, is the fact that he notes the duplication of _Subjecti_ and _Vigilate_ in I Ptr. 1:1-4:11 (= Peter A) and 4:12ff. (= Peter B). This

---

about them has been gained through M. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," pp. 212-213.

On 'parenesis': see M. Dibelius, _Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums_, pp. 234-265. Also his _Der Brief des Jakobus_ (_KEK_, 8th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 1-10. Cf. J. W. C. Wand, _The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude_ (_WC_; London: Methuen & Co., 1934), pp. 3-9.

[1] Philip Carrington, _Primitive Christian Catechism_ (Cambridge: The University Press, 1940).

duplication corresponds, so thinks Carrington, to the literary character of the two sections; the former is baptismal, while the latter constitutes an 'exhortation to martyrdom addressed primarily to the elders.' His recognition of a division between the two alleged sections was anticipated by Perdelwitz, as we shall see later.

Carrington's basic view found its ardent and strong advocate in Selwyn, whose commentary is worthy of being called a monumental work in the course of research on I Peter. We limit ourselves here to surveying his study set out in Essay II (pp. 365-466) in his commentary.[1]

The first stratum of catechetical material as detected by Selwyn is a 'Christian Holiness Code' (B^1) which underlies I and II Thessalonians and I Peter (and Acts 15:29); the keywords of the Code are ἀπέχεσθαι and ἁγιάζειν, which seem to correspond to Lev. 19:2, quoted in I Ptr. 1:16 *verbatim*. The second stratum (B^2) of the material is discovered in Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, I Peter and James; this stratum is regarded as constituting a baptismal catechism, of which the components are a) the 'Truth' of the 'Word of Truth,' b) Deponentes, c) Induentes, d) a section on worship, and e) a section on church order and unity.

---

[1] E.G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1946; 2nd ed., 1947). On the commentary see the following reviews:

M. S. Enslin, *JQR*, XXXVII (1946-47), 259-297; W. L. Knox, *Theology*, No. 317 (1949), 342-344; E. Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im l. Petrusbrief," *ZNW*, XLV (1954), 71-72; F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (2nd ed.), pp. 181ff. Knox's review is unduly critical. Lohse seems to be right in pointing out that the easy association of the form-critical approach with the problem of Petrine authenticity constitutes a serious flaw in the work.

The two strata of catechetical material as identified by Selwyn are nothing other than a modified form of the thesis advanced by Carrington, though the former is credited with originality in his differentiating the two strata from each other as of different origins. Selwyn also differs from Carrington in recognizing the homogeneity of the affinities in I and II Thessalonians and I Peter. Selwyn shows marked differences from his precursor, however, in his treatment of the third stratum, the 'Persecution-Form' (P). Selwyn thinks that Carrington's treatment of Vigilate and State is unsatisfactory, and proposes to see a particular pattern, designed to meet the situation at the brink of persecution, in the scheme of Vigilate-State. Besides the affinities between the Thessalonian epistles and I Peter, Selwyn notes that in these two writings (as well as in Acts 14:22 and Jas. 1:2, 3, 12; 5:8) the persecution-motif and the eschatology-motif are closely interwinded; the idea of the inevitability of persecution for Christian was, so thinks Selwyn, a 'regular part of the Apostolic teaching,' based upon the verba Christi (cf. Matt. 5:11).

Selwyn's study on the 'Persecution-Form,' in particular, has later been taken up and modified by Nauck, to whom we shall return later.

B. 'Haustafel.' The existence and the notable nature of certain parenetic sections in the N.T. pertaining to the relationships of social classes and status have been recognized by scholars for decades.[1] We are reminded by Dibelius of Harnack's notable remark, in which he, Harnack, sets out the future direction of study as regards the special parenetic sections.[2] The course of study suggested by Harnack yielded an important work by Weidinger who traced the possible background of the Christian 'Haustafeln' to the parenetic material transmitted orally for the propaganda of Hellenistic Judaism on the one hand, and to the Hellenistic popular philosophy and folk ethics on the other hand.[3] Weidinger's treatment of the 'Haustafel' on I Peter is a sketchy one; the following points, however, are noted:

---

[1] Cf. e.g., H. Gunkel, Der erste Brief des Petrus, pp. 42ff.; M. Dibelius, Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Literatur, Vol. II, pp. 65ff. Also his An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon (HNT: Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1927; 3rd ed., 1953), pp. 48-50. Dibelius refers, in the commentary just mentioned above, to J. Bernays, Gesammelt Abhandlungen (1885), Vol. I, pp. 192 ff.); Praechter, Hierokles der Historiker; Klein, Der älteste christl. Katechismus, et al.

[2] A. von Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (5th ed.), Vol. I, p. 173, fn. 3 (Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte . . .,")p. 212.

[3] K. Weidinger, Die Haustafeln (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrische Buchhandlung, 1928).

first, he traces the process of Christianization of the current rules, and secondly, he follows the course of their modification of the rules and their final disappearance in the life-setting of the early Church.

C. 'Persecution Form.' As we have noted above, one of the notable features of Selwyn's study is his identification of the 'persecution form' in the catechetical material as represented in I Peter. Selwyn's suggestion has been taken up and modified by Nauck.[1] Lohse's study may also be regarded as a modification of the suggestion set out by Selwyn.[2] We shall survey Lohse's study first.

It is Lohse's main thesis that I Peter as a whole comprises a kind of 'Persecution Form' as addressed to Christians who are in trial; the Epistle was written in order to encourage and comfort them, and for this purpose, he utilized, while making certain adaptations, the parenetic material which he had taken over from the traditional material transmitted primarily in an oral form. One conspicuous stratum of the parenetic tradition as represented in our Epistle is the so-called '*Haustafel*' (2:11-3:12). While this unit reflects Hellenistic colouring, the *Gedankengut*, as he calls it, of this unit may well be explicable from its Palestinian-Jewish origin. Basically the same thing may be said, so thinks Lohse, of the two remaining sections, 1:1-2:10 and 3:13ff. That which characterizes the Petrine usage of the parenetic tradition is, in Lohse's view, a close association of the tradition with the early Christian kerygma. Certain features shared by the parenetic material in I Peter and, e.g., Pauline epistles are not to be taken as a basis for a relationship of direct literary dependence, but as indicative of a common derivation from certain traditional material current in the Church.

---

[1] Wolfgang Nauck, "Freude im Leiden--Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition--," *ZNW*, XLVI (1955), 68-80.

[2] Eduard Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im l. Petrusbrief," *ZNW*, XLV (1954), 68-89.

Nauck's study is an attempt to prove that the motif of 'joy in suffering' as represented in I Ptr. 1:6; 4:13-14; Jas. 1:2, 12 goes back to the same tradition which lies behind Matt. 5:11-12 and Lk. 6:22-23. His attempt is made on the basis of conceptual and structural similarities shared by these passages. In Nauck's view, 'the basis of this tradition is very old,' and certain variations exhibited among them are explicable only in terms of its transmission orally. One contention, which Nauck raises against Selwyn, is that Selwyn's statement, "The thought of rejoicing in suffering is specifically Christian and goes back to our Lord's own teaching,"[1] is not supported in view of a history-of-religion parallel as we have in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (48:48-50; 52:5-7; 54:16-18); that is, the motif of 'joy in suffering' as we find in I Peter has a 'common Later-Judaistic and primitive-Christian tradition.' Nauck traces the Sitz im Leben of the tradition in the Maccabean revolt. With regard to the motif in I Peter, Nauck concludes that its usage cannot be related to any specific historical situation; instead, so Nauck argues, the situation envisaged here is a (apocalyptic) strife between God and Satan.

---

[1] Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 450.

(ii) Liturgical Material

Under this heading we include credal formulae, hymnic material and liturgical prayer. Admittedly the citation of credal formulae does not necessarily require a liturgical setting; non-liturgical situations could have affected the form as well as the contents of the formula.[1] The distinction between the two, however, cannot be easily made in the case of a relevant passage integrated into parenetic sections as in I Peter.[2] We will follow here the scholars' definition of the 'forms.'

A. Credal Formula. That the earliest forms of credal formulae are recognized in the N.T. has been one of the assured results of form-critical study. This view is convincingly presented by Cullmann[1] and Kelly,[2] but the same view was already held by Lietzmann in his two articles which formed part of the significant series of 'Symbolstudien.'[3] In one of his articles Lietzmann mentioned I Ptr. 3:18-22 as one of the instances which reflect the early Christian credal formulae, and, in view of an inserted comment on baptism in vss. 20-21, the significance of a baptismal setting as an occasion to which formulation and citation of the credal formulae were related.[4]

---

[1] Cf. O. Cullmann, Les Premières Confessions de foi Chretienne (2nd ed.; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948), chap. II, pp. 13ff.

[2] We will discuss later on the definition of the forms at the pertinent section of our study.

The credal nature of I Ptr. 3:18ff. was also recognized by Feine,[5] who thought that the passage had the character of a baptismal confession, and bore the closest resemblances, among the alleged baptismal confessions in the N.T., to the later 'credal forms'

---

[1] Cullmann, *Les Premières Confessions de foi Chretienne*.

[2] J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1960), esp. pp. 1-29.

[3] Hans Lietzmann, "Die Urform des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses" (1919) in *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), Vol. III, pp. 182-189. Also his "Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses" (1921) in *ibid.*, pp. 163-188.

[4] "Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses."

[5] Paul Feine, *Die Gestalt des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntinisses in der Zeit des N.Ts.* (Leipzig: Doerffling & Funke, 1925).

(*Symbolformen*).[1] In his view I Peter attests that by the time of its writing baptisants were required to recite a tripartite creed, since 3:13ff. represents not only a 'teaching about baptism,' but also a 'baptismal confession';[2] furthermore, trinitarian formulations can be, so thinks Feine, detected in our Epistle (e.g., 1:3-12; 1:13-2:10).

Stauffer also noted the credal-formulary character of 3:18ff. and its relation to a baptismal ceremony (cf. Rom. 10:9; Eph. 4:5).[3] The view was again taken up by Cullmann, who maintained that the antithetical phrase in 3:18 indicated the second stage of development, along with the humiliation-exaltation motif, of the ancient credal formula which was originally in a very brief form; at the same time, the combination of the forgiveness of sins and the suffering-death of Christ showed, so thinks Cullmann, a stage prior to the weakening of the christological motif.[4] Cullmann regards the passage, 3:18ff., as an indication of the fact that even a one-article christological creed has to refer to baptism when it was used as a baptismal creed.

---

[1] On this point he agrees with W. Bornemann, "Der erste Petrusbrief--eine Taufrede des Silvanus?" *ZNW*, XIX (1919-20), 143-165.

[2] This point is further confirmed by Feine by appealing to e.g., a phrase in 3:21, (ἀλλὰ) συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, which he regards as a prayer offered by a baptisant for the remission of sins.

[3] E. Stauffer, *Theologie des N.Ts.* (Stuttgart:Kohlhammer Verlag, 1945), p. 214.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 22ff.

Selwyn also recognizes the existence of some credal material in I Peter, on the assumption that its existence is attested as a known fact elsewhere in the N.T.[1] He does not, however, identify any particular passage as a composite unit of such a formula; he rather tries to see the scattered reflection of the kerygmatic core which stands very close to the one represented in the first ten chapters of Acts;[2] the core as detected by Selwyn is almost identical with that of Dodd.[3] One thing to be noted concerning Selwyn's view is his insistence that the close affinity among the alleged credal formulae is indicative of the fact that the formulae existed and were transmitted in a written form.

Now comes the notable article by Bultmann, who concentrates his attention mainly on two passages, 3:18-22 and 2:21-25.[4] The former passage, as distinguished from the latter of a hymnodic character, constitutes, so thinks Bultmann, a credal fragment to which the writer of I Peter gave a redactoral touch by adding a phrase and a word; as for vs. 22 a particle is inserted.

---

[1] Cf. I Thess. 1:9-10; Heb. 11:6; I Cor. 15:1-4; I Tim. 3:16; II Tim. 1:13; Tit. 1:9; II Thess. 2:15; 3:6. Op. cit., pp. 400-402.

[2] Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 72-75; also pp. 75-115.

[3] Cf. C. H. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, pp. 21-35.

[4] "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," pp. 1-14.

Bultmann conjectures that 1:20 may have constituted an introductory part, to which such phrases as πιστεύω εἰς or ὁμολογουμαι ἐν may have been added; in view of the contents and relative brevity as well as grammatical and linguistic features.[1] he suggests that the passage was a baptismal confession.

B. Hymnic Material. The existence of hymnodic material in the N.T. also has been recognized for decades.[2] As regards I Peter, Windisch points in his commentary to the existence of a few christological hymns in it (e.g., 1:18-21; 2:21-25; 3:18-22).[3] In view of the excursus attached to the second edition (1930) of his commentary, we assume that Windisch may have thought of the *Sitz im Leben* in terms of a baptismal setting;[4] he does not, however, present any attempt to reconstruct the hymns nor indicate any problem in our reconstructing them.

---

[1] The use of participial construction and relative pronouns as well as antithetical phrases is noted. On these he refers to E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1913), pp. 201-207. To Norden's work we shall come back later.

[2] Cf. M. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte . . . ," pp. 219-225. Also E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus* (2nd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961).

[3] H. Windisch-H. Preisker, *Die katholische Briefe* (*HNT*, 3rd ed.), *passim*.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 82. He called the section 1:3-4:11 a 'baptismal address.'

Bultmann called the *Gattung* of 2:21ff. a 'hymnodic fragment,' while noting certain correspondence between that passage and 3:18ff.[1] According to his view, the former passage took over from a traditional liturgical text the interpretation of Christ's suffering as exemplary. This is confirmed, so thinks Bultmann, by grammatical context-analytical and stylistic factors represented in the passage.[2]

Selwyn thinks that a 'written' source (note περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ in 2:6) underlies 2:6-8,[3] and defines the *Gattung* of the source as a hymn. One of the clues is the mosaic character of the passage composed of various O.T. passages and phrases. In view of the representation of the same mosaic character in the canonical and non-canonical material, Selwyn thinks that the passage concerned was "in the true line of Hebraic 'strophe'--that is to say, 'a group of verses, connected together by a certain unity of thought,'"[4] and he suggests that the deviation from the LXX as represented in the passage was due to a requirement of rhythm.

---

[1] Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," pp. 12-13.

[2] In passing we may note certain discrepancies between this view and that expressed in his *Theologie des N.Ts.* (3rd ed.), p. 532, where he argues that the motif of the *imitatio Christi* in I Peter is the writer's modification of Paul's idea. We shall discuss this issue later.

[3] Preisker, in the third edition of Windisch's commentary, sees in 2:1-10 a three-strophe festal song (*Die katholische Briefe*, p. 158). Yet he suggests that vss. 6-8 may have originated in a *Testimoniensammelung*.

[4] Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 276.

A monograph by Boismard is devoted to the general theme that there are four baptismal hymns in our Epistle.[1] As regards the first hymn (1:3-5) he notes its similarity to Tit. 3:4-7 and concludes that the "structure and the formation of the baptismal hymn seems to be much more faithfully retained in the Petrine passage than in Titus." In the second hymn (1:20 + 3:18 + 3:22) Boismard notes two strata of liturgical material; i.e., a Christological hymn and a baptismal credo; the two were combined by the Petrine redactor. He thinks it highly probable that the third passage (2:22-25a) was a primitive Christian hymn. The alleged affinities between this passage and I Jn. 3:1-10 lead him to think that both passages were derived from a common source. The fourth hymn (5:5-9) was theo-centric as regards its contents, and was characterized by its homiletic style; the style was due, so conjectures Boismard, to the fact that it was originally a 'hymnodic exhortation' addressed to the neophytes by the one who presided at the baptismal ceremony prior to the ceremony of renunciation. One of the notable features of Boismard's study is that he tries to determine the date of these hymns.

---

[1] M. -E. Boismard, Quatre Hymnes Baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961).

Since the reflection of the hymns, especially the first and third, can be seen in Romans (dated at the beginning of A.D. 58) he sets the *terminus ad quem* around A.D. 56-57.

C. Liturgical Prayer. It is the general thesis maintained by Coutts[1] that a liturgical prayer, connected with a baptismal setting, underlies Eph. 1:3-14 and I Ptr. 1:3-12. In these two passages the prayer is represented with a similar structure, but not with identical contents; he sees a notable difference between Petrine passage and the Ephesian one, in the change of style in the former; i.e., from prayer to exhortation. Coutts notes the liturgical character of our passage as being integral to the Epistle which is related to a baptismal setting.

(iii) Baptismal Discourse

That the language of I Peter is saturated with baptismal motifs has been noted by scholars. It was, however, the thesis maintained by Perdelwitz[2] that had a notable influence upon the subsequent discussion of the literary character of our Epistle. According to Perdelwitz, I Peter is composed of two originally independent documents; the first document (1:1-4:11), as distinguished from the second,[1] was a baptismal sermon delivered at the baptismal ceremony; thus the passage includes a section of appropriate instructions on Christian life presumably given to the newly baptized.

---

[1] J. Coutts, "Ephesians 1:3-14 and I Peter 1:3-12."

[2] R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbrief* (*RVV*; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1911).

While a similar view was held by Bornemann,[2] independent of Perdelwitz, the latter found his followers in Streeter,[3] Windisch,[4] A. Meyer,[5] Jülicher,[6] Beare,[7] and Hauck,[8] though without serious exegetical discussion.

---

[1] The second document (4:12ff.), which begins with *agapētoi*, was regarded by Perdelwitz as a letter of encouragement and warning addressed to the Christians facing 'fiery trial.' The division theory advanced by him was anticipated by Kühl (*Die Briefe Petri und Judae*, p. 36).

[2] W. Bornemann, "Der 1. Ptr. . . . des Silvanus?" He endorses Harnack's hypothesis presented in *Die Chronologie* (e.g., p. 455) against Jülicher's criticism of Harnack.

[3] Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, p. 124.

[4] Windisch, *Die katholische Briefe* (2nd ed., 1930), pp. 76-77 and 82.

[5] A. Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jakobusbriefes*, p. 75.

[6] Julicher, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, pp. 199ff.

[7] Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (2nd ed., 1958), pp. 6-9. Beare thinks that νῦν in 2:25 refers to the baptism "*now* administered" (p. 125, italics mine). This particular remark, however, is incomprehensible, since he regards 1:3-4:11 as a "baptismal discourse, addressed to a group of *recent* converts" (p. 7, italics mine). How does he reconcile the apparent discrepancy, shown in his temporal references? This discrepancy seems to be due to his inconsistency in defining the literary character of I Peter.

Certain inconsistencies in Beare's commentary have been noted by Lohse ("Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 73, fn. 24).

[8] Hauck, *Die Kirchenbriefe*, p. 36.

The hypothesis propounded by Perdelwitz seems to be in need of thorough re-examination at least from syntactical[1] and style-critical[2] points of view. Nevertheless, this line of approach is also a reminder of how influential liturgical practice was in formulating theological thinking.

(iv) Baptismal Liturgy

There have been three notable attempts to detect the framework of a baptismal liturgy; i.e., the works by Preisker, Cross and Boismard.[3]

In his revision of the second edition of Windisch's commentary, Preisker added a note in which he advanced a thesis that a definite framework of the "early Christian worship of a baptismal congregation" was present in the first section of our Epistle (i.e., 1:3-4:11); the second section had to do, so thinks Preisker, with the "concluding worship of the entire community."[4]

---

[1] Note the use of ei as regards the persecution in the second (!) section (4:14, 16), which is supposed to be concerned with an actual persecution. On the other hand, the optative mood in the first section cannot be pressed too much in view of the delineation of the usage of the mood in vulgar Greek from the Classical (Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 157).

[2] Cf. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," p. 232.

[3] To these one may add Dom Irénée Fransen, "Une homélie chretienne," Bibel et Vie Chretienne (January, 1960), pp. 28-38.

[4] Windisch-Preisker, Die katholische Briefe (3rd ed., 1951), pp. 156-162.

The outline of the alleged baptismal liturgy as detected by Preisker was taken up, almost in its original form, by Cross, who claimed that the first section reflected the details of the "celebrant's part for the Paschal Vigil, for which . . . the Baptismal Eucharist text must have been carefully prepared."[1] The frequent use of 'suffering' (πάθημα - παθεῖν), which was regarded as corresponding to the word play on παθεῖν and πάσχα, was indicative, so thinks Cross, of the paschal setting.

The line of argument advanced by Preisker has been taken up also by Boismard in his two articles,[2] of which the main thesis is that I Peter "produced, at least in part, a baptismal liturgy." He traces the reflection of the liturgy in our Epistle, and comes out with a result which overlaps in part with that of Preisker and Cross. What seems to be most notable in Boismard's reconstruction is the fact that he distinguishes the reflection of the liturgy from the redactoral additions and changes;[3]

---

[1] F. L. Cross, I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1954), p. 37.

[2] M. -E. Boismard, "Une Liturgie baptismale dans la Prima Petri," RB, LXIII (1956), 182-208; LXIV (1957), 161-183.

[3] For instance, 1:10-12 is regarded as an addition made by the redactor; 3:13-4:6 has been inserted between 3:8-9 and 4:7-11 which originally composed a unit. 4:12-5:4 is regarded as not having belonged to the original liturgy; in the inserted passage Boismard notes the existence of "diverse elements of a baptismal CREDO." (i.e., 3:18, 19, 21b, 22; 4:5).

he thinks it certain that the liturgy is reflected in Titus, I John, Colossians and James. Boismard's reconstruction of the liturgy is modified in his later work, which we have mentioned elsewhere.[1]

The cases presented by these scholars are based upon a dual assumption, i.e., that the prevalence of baptismal motif~~s~~ in our Epistle provides the basis for reconstruction of an actual baptismal liturgy, and that the significant break (especially noted by Preisker and Cross) between 4:11 and 4:12 suggests different origins of the two sections; the clues for the latter part of the assumption are the use of a doxology in 4:11 and the hypothetical character of the references to persecution in the first section. We have referred to the latter clues elsewhere;[2] as for the use of a doxology in the N.T., its appearance in 4:11 is not enough to prove that this verse is the end of a document.[3] As regards the former part of the assumption, it can be pointed out that the scholars do not present any clear-cut explanation of the relation between the reconstructed liturgy and the epistolary form of the present writing.[1] Furthermore, the absence of any source in the literature of the early Church comparable to the alleged baptismal liturgy contributes to the undermining of the force of their argument.[2]

---

[1] *Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre* (1961).

[2] Cf. further W. C. van Unnik, "Christianity according to 1. Peter," *ExpT.*, LXVIII (1956), 80.

[3] Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 220. He refers to Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1909), pp. 466f.

(v) Testimonia

In the course of study directed toward detecting the 'testimonial' material, it was Harris who made an important contribution by setting up a hypothesis that, in the early Church, passages from the O.T. were collected as a body of proof-texts for missionary and apologetic purposes.[3] Harris was in agreement with F. C. Burkitt in assuming that the 'logia' meant by Papias was this book of testimonial material and that the compiler was Matthew the Apostle.

---

[1] The need for such an explanation is also pointed out by T. C. G. Thornton, "I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?" JThS, N.S. 12 (1961), 26. Cf. pp. 25-26. Cf. J. Michl, "Der erste Petrusbrief," in Das Neue Testament, Vol. III (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1953), p. 195.

For a pertinent exegetical remark, see Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 78, fn. 50. Lohse draws our attention to the aorist tense of ἀναγεννήσας (1:3), one of cardinal baptismal motifs in I Peter. Lohse thinks that the utilization of this tense is evidence strong enough to preclude the hypothesis of Taufgottesdienst (cf. also pp. 68-70).

[2] Lohse, ibid., p. 70. Cross's appeal to Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition met an historiographically perceptive criticism by Thornton ("I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?" pp. 14-26). Against Cross, see also C. F. D. Moule, "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter," NTS, III (1956), esp. 4-7.

[3] J. Rendel Harris, Testimonies (Cambridge: The University Press; Part I, 1916; Part II, 1920).

Windisch notes in the second edition of his commentary, in accordance with Harris's view, the existence of a testimonial collection of O.T. quotations behind I Ptr. 2:6ff.[1] The absence of Ps. 117:22 (LXX) from the combination of O.T. quotations in the passage, as well as the parallel citation of the Psalm passage in other N.T. writings, led him to deny the existence of a relation of direct literary dependence between the Petrine passage and Rom. 9:32-33. The same view on the passage concerned is held by Hunter.[2]

Dodd has advanced Harris's main thesis, with due corrections, in his notable book on the issue.[3] As regards I Ptr. 2:6-8 and Rom. 9:32-33, Dodd notes the similarities and differences shared by the two passages in quoting the O.T. As regards the Petrine dependence, however, Dodd thinks that the thesis can be maintained "only on the rather unlikely assumption that he [the writer of I Peter] first entangled the conflated passages, and then supplemented them with parts of Isa. 28:16 which Paul had omitted, and yet that he did not supplement them out of the LXX, since his version does not entirely agree with the LXX even where there is no Pauline parallel."[1] A more likely explanation, as proposed by Dodd, is that the two writers utilized a "twofold testimonium already current in the pre-canonical tradition in a version differing somewhat from the LXX."[2] On I Ptr. 2:22ff., Dodd thinks that the passage is composed of free quotations from the Suffering Servant poem, which, in view of the prevalent representation of almost every verse of the poem in many parts of the N.T., he regards as one of the most important sources of testimonia; and the use of the poem seems to go back to the "earliest period of the history of the early Church to which we have access."[3]

---

[1] Windisch-Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, pp. 60-61. Cf. Jeremias in TWNT, IV, 275-276.

[2] A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 61-63.

[3] C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952). On Dodd's criticism of Harris's study, see pp. 26-27.

The problem of comparable evidence, the Achilles' heel of the thesis, has now been solved, at least partially, with the discovery of 4Q Testimonia.[4] The line of research suggested by these scholars seems to be a likely working hypothesis.

---

[1] Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 43. Cf. Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma . . .," p. 80, fn. 65. Lohse's remark is in agreement with, though independent of, Dodd.

[2] Dodd, loc. cit. [3] Ibid., p. 94.

[4] Cf. J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (SBT; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959), pp. 61-64.

(vi) Concluding Remarks

Instead of epitomizing the details and the impact of form-critical approaches upon the research of I Peter, especially with regard to the literary affinities represented in our Epistle, we shall examine Beare's view of the methodology.

Beare thinks that the "application of form-critical methods to the analysis has yielded and will yield valuable results";[1] yet he contends that "the fact of *literary* dependence" (italicized by Beare) is not, even in the study of the Synoptic Gospels which are subjected to the form-critical inquiry, obliterated by the inquiry, since "the most ardent form critic will be the first," so thinks Beare, "to admit the literary dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark, if not also on the hypothetical 'Q.'"[2] This particular comment by Beare is coupled with an annoucement of his abandoning the affirmative position which he once held with regard to the '*Haustafel*.'[3]

Beare's view and the analogy may be justified if they concern the literary relation between Jude and

---

[1] F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (2nd ed., 1958), p. 196.

[2] *Ibid.* Cf. pp. 192ff.; esp. pp. 195-196.

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 113.

II Peter, since the latter's dependence upon the former can be established with a fair certainty.[1] However, the alleged dependence of II Peter upon I Peter has been questioned anew[2] in spite of II Ptr. 3:1f., which has been customarily taken as a direct reference to I Peter.[3] We are called upon to exert caution in assuming direct literary dependence on the basis of sporadic parallels alone.

The problem presented in Beare's contention, however, purports to be a more serious one, since, if what he says is a pertinent observation, it would undermine the plausibility of various form-critical approaches directed to I Peter. Since the form-critical method has, as we shall see later, important bearings upon our study, we must do our best to answer Beare's view of the method. The following points may be noted against Beare:

---

[1] Cf. J. B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1907), pp. 1-15. Also J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T. (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918), esp. pp. 347-353. A. Wikenhauser, Einleitung in das N.T. (3rd ed.; Basel/Freiburg/Wien: Herders, 1959), esp. pp. 367ff.

To be compared with these is C. Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901), pp. 216-224 and 224ff.

[2] Cf. G. H. Boobyer, "The Indebtedness of 2. Peter to 1. Peter" in New Testament Essays, Studies in memory of T.W. Manson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 34-53.

[3] Cf. e.g., R. Knopf, Die Briefe Petri und Judae (KEK, 1912), p. 254. Also Windisch-Presker, Die katholische Briefe, p. 99.

First, Beare's view appears not to do full justice to the fact that the literary nature of the Gospels and the place of 'source,' or *Traditionsstoff*, in them, are different from those of the Epistles. In the Gospels the Evangelists are interested primarily in presenting the life and words of Jesus in a certain framework; sources of various categories are utilized for this purpose. Thus the Gospels are basically *Sammelwerke*; the Evangelists are not authors in the proper sense, but they are redactors of sources.[1] The differences from the Epistles seem to be obvious: the literary character of the Epistles is determined by the writers' practical concern to respond to the concrete situations of the Church, and this concern seems to result in a more direct, extensive reflection of (or reference to) a more varied categories (e.g., various liturgical expressions and the parenetic commonplace) of the *Traditionsstoff*. Contrary to Fascher who limits the application of the form-critical method only to the Gospels,[2] we do affirm the applicability of the method to the N.T. writings such as the epistles and Acts. At the same time, however, we note the differences which we have noted above. Beare's reference,with regard to the applicability of form criticism, to the example of the Gospel study seems to be not so appropriate.

---

[1] Cf. e.g., W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1964), *passim*.

[2] Erich Fascher, *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Beihefte zur *ZNW*), *II* (1924), 52. We owe this reference to Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," p. 209. Cf. G. Iber, "Neuere Literatur zur Formgeschichte," in M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1959), pp. 302-312.

Secondly, Beare's contention appears to be mounted on very shaky exegetical ground. His negative view is expressed especially against the form-critical study carried out by Selwyn, with an appeal, first, to an article by Mitton[1] (who, in Beare's view, demonstrated the case for the literary dependence of I Peter on Ephesians "beyond dispute"), and secondly, to the deutero-Pauline character of Ephesians. We have already reviewed, though not exhaustively, Mitton's fuller study on the issue. Here we limit ourselves to pointing out that Mitton's confined examination of alleged parallels between I Peter and the Pauline epistles is not sufficient to clarify the extent and nature of the parallels, if there are pertinent parallels in different strata of traditions and in various writings in the N.T., to say nothing of the history-of-concept parallels. Mitton's study on I Ptr. 1:3 (and its parallels) and 2:2-6 (and its parallels) does not prove, so it seems to us, anything beyond the existence of certain literary affinities

---

[1] C. L. Mitton, "The Relationship of I Peter and Ephesians," JThS, N.S. 1 (1950), 67-73.

(not 'direct literary dependence') between or among the instances concerned. Once this inadequacy in the presentation of evidence is noted, the deutero-Pauline character of Ephesians seems not to have a direct bearing upon the issue concerned.

As a whole, Beare's view does not appear to be a valid evaluation of the implication of the form-critical studies as carried out in relation to I Peter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

We have withheld until now the presentation of our methodology because we thought that the implication of our methodology would be clarified better against the background of the various approaches in previous research on I Peter.

We call our methodology 'history-of-tradition' (*traditionsgeschichtliche*) study. By this we mean the effort to recognize, on the basis of exegetical examination of a given text, traditional material of various sorts, or traces of it, and to inquire into the relation of this traditional material to other strata of theological traditions current in the Church, and to establish the place of the material in the context of the history of theological thought of the early Church.

Our attention will be primarily directed to the so-called literary affinities represented in the 'formulary material' (this we shall define later) in our Epistle. The legitimacy and the usefulness of the form-critical method constitute the premise of our study.[1] Our study tries to go beyond that method with an understanding that the outcome of its application (at least in the narrow sense of defining the Gattung and determining the possible Sitz im Leben), does not necessarily explicate the organic relation of the traditional material to other traditional material reflected in the rest of the N.T. writings, or to the theological strata, which underlies the whole complex of traditional material in the N.T. This problem with the form-critical method seems to have been recognized by Cullmann,[2] who is seconded by Schelkle,[3] in his preference for the term Formungsgeschichte or Traditionsgeschichte to Formgeschichte.

No study of I Peter from this methodological point of view has been undertaken, to my knowledge, on a comprehensive scale. Schelkle has a suggestive section, entitled 'Traditions-und Formgeschichte,' in the introduction to I Peter in his excellent commentary, one of the most recent.[1] In that section he distinguishes two strata of traditional material, i.e., '*liturgisch-kultische Ueberlieferung*' and '*katechetisch-paränetische Ueberlieferung*,' and presents an outline of their components. However, the range of the material classified by him under these two strata appears to be not comprehensive enough; furthermore, he does not go into detailed examination of them.[2] Hence it seems to be a legitimate enterprise to undertake this study from the proposed methodological standpoint.

---

[1] As we shall see in Part Two, the form-critical inquiry constitutes the preliminary study of some passages (1:3-4, 17a, 18-19, 20; 3:18ff.). With regard to the formulary pieces, the Gattungen of which seem almost self-explanatory, the history-of-liturgy survey will take the place of the form-critical examination. These two kinds of inquiry will be made on 1:3-4, a eulogical formula.

[2] Oscar Cullmann, "Les récentes études sur la formation de la tradition évangelique," RAPr, V (1925), 467.

[3] Karl Hermann Schelkle, Die Passion Jesu (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1949).

---

[1] K. H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe: der Judasbrief* (*HTHNT*; Freiburg: Herders, 1961), pp. 4-7.

[2] In passing it is to be remembered that Schelkle admits that I Peter shares close 'literary similarities' with the Pauline epistles, and he seems to take these similarities as the indication of the Petrine dependence upon the Pauline epistles (see *Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., e.g., p. 101 on ἐν Χριστῷ). In this regard, his reference to Aleith and Barnett, and against Percy, to Mitton is to be noted (*ibid.*, p. 6, fn. 1). While Schelkle seems to recognize that an epoch-making step has been taken by Selwyn in evaluating the alleged 'points of literary contact' (*ibid.*, pp. 6-7), he seems not to have grasped fully the implication of Selwyn's methodology for the elucidation of the nature of the literary similarities, which I Peter shares with the Pauline (and deutero-Pauline) epistles.

PART TWO

THE FORMULARY MATERIAL IN FIRST PETER

CHAPTER I

THE DEFINITION OF FORMULARY MATERIAL

SECTION I

Preliminary Definition

Under 'formulary material,' we are to be concerned with the 'liturgical and/or credal'[1] formulae[2] as represented in I Peter. Other strata of a more or less formulary nature, especially the parenetic material in our Epistle (i.e., so-called *Haustafel*,[3] a catalogue of vices,[4] and also possible reflection of the *verba*

---

[1] The present writer is aware of the awkwardness of this expression. An attempt will be made to elucidate this collocation later.

[2] The 'formulary' (*formelhaftige*) character of a given passage will be discerned by our noting, in the passage, syntactical and stylistic criterial, which we shall survey in the next section.

[3] Cf. e.g., H. Gunkel, *Der erste Brief des Petrus*, pp. 42ff.; M. Dibelius, *Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Literatur*, Vol. II, pp. 65ff. Also his *An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon* (*HNT*), pp. 48-50; K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln*, pp. 62-63; J. W. C. Wand, *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (*WC*; London: Methuen & Co., 1934), pp. 3-9; Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe*, pp. 96-98.

[4] Cf. B. S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists," *JBL*, LI (1932), 1-12. Also S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im N.T.* (Beihefte zur ZNW, XXV; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1959), esp. pp. 77ff.

Christi,[1] etc.) are not of primary concern to us.

At the outset, we will state what is meant by the two adjectives, 'liturgical' and 'credal.' By 'liturgical' is meant the character of formulae pertaining to a context of corporate worship, for which and in which formulary expression of faith in various forms was created and employed. Under 'liturgical formulae,'[2] therefore, one may include such forms as the liturgical creed,[3] hymn, prayer, eulogy, doxology, liturgical salutation (e.g., a 'peace'-formula), and *Amen*. It is assumed that the formulary character, or fixed and prescribed manner of expression, is indicative of communal and customary use of these formulae.

We take the adjective 'credal' as an equivalent of '*bekenntnisartige*,' denoting the nature of any given passage expressing the basic themes of faith in a formulary manner. 'Credal formulae' in this sense, therefore, include not only the well-structured trinitarian schema as, e.g., in II Cor. 13:13 or Matt. 28:19, but also fragmentary monopartite or bipartite 'credal' statements with formulary features; we are primarily concerned with the latter type of material in the N.T. research, and so we shall be in the present study.

---

[1] Cf. E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, esp. pp. 442-458; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1964), esp. pp. 370ff.; J. P. Brown, "Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form-History," *NTS*, X (1963), 27-48.

[2] Here I follow in the main the definition of the term I made in my unpublished T. B. Blackstone Fellowship thesis, "Liturgical Forms and Practises as Reflected in the N.T." (Chicago: McCormick Theological Seminary, 1960), p. x. In an excursus attached to the thesis (pp. 109-120), I tried to elucidate, though cursorily, the etymological and lexicographical problems of λειτουργία and λατρεία.

[3] Cf. G. Delling, *Der Gottesdienst im N.T.*, esp. pp. 78-79; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Romer* (*KEK*, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 167-169; H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I/II* (*HNT*, 4th ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--,1949), p. 61.

The somewhat awkward collocation of two adjectives, 'liturgical and/or credal,' has stemmed from our noting a difficult Gattung-analytical (and Sitz-defining) problem with regard to the distinction between liturgical formulae, on the one hand--especially hymnodic material--and credal material, on the other. The difficulty of drawing a clear distinction between hymnodic material and credal formulae has been noted by others.[1] In order to illustrate the case we may refer to

---

[1] E.g., M. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," esp. pp. 221-222; R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 9. Cf. Bultmann's review of O. Cullmann, Les Premières Confessions de foi Chretienne in TLZ, LXXIV (1949), esp. 49. Also H. Lietzmann, "Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses," p. 176.

The sixth chapter of G. Delling's notable work, Der Gottesdienst im N.T. (1952), is entitled "Bekenntnis und Hymnus." In this chapter Delling deals with the longer liturgical formulae. It is his view that we cannot find any longer, formulated confession (of faith) in the N.T.; what can be found are many hymnodic fragments in primitive Christian literature which reflects a 'credal character,' which allows us to infer the use of the hymnodic fragments in the service of worship (ibid., p. 81). A similar view to Delling's has been expressed by Lietzmann, who maintains that what we find in the N.T. are the 'Bekenntnistyp,' not the 'Bekenntnisformel' ("Symbolstudien," ZNW, XXII 1923 , 263). The definition

I Ptr. 3:18-22, on which two Gattungen are conferred by differing scholars.[1] This difficulty seems due to the following two causes:

First, the Sitz of credal formulae are not limited to 'liturgical' ones.

Secondly, 'credal' contents may well be presented in a 'liturgical formulary' framework.

With regard to the first point, Cullmann expressly and pertinently observes that circumstances, motivating the appearance and use of 'credal' formulae may have been of several kinds; i.e., as related to 1) baptism and catechetical instruction, 2) regular worship (liturgy and preaching), 3) exorcism, 4) persecutions, and 5) polemic against heresy.[2]

---

of the two types of 'credal' material as distinguished by Lietzmann and Delling is not presented explicitly. Furthermore, neither of them discusses the problem of whether the Sitz of credal material is to be limited to the setting of corporate worship.

[1] The credal nature of I Ptr. 3:18-22 is upheld by Lietzmann, "Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses," pp. 174-175 . (He calls the passage a 'liturgische Bekenntnis'); Bultmann, "Bekenntnis-und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," passim; Cullmann, Les Premières Confessions de la foi Chretienne, pp. 14-15; and Leconte, Les Epitres catholique, p. 110.

The hymnodic nature of the same passage is affirmed by Windisch-Preisker (Die katholische Briefe, p. 70) and Boismard (Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre, esp. pp. 57-67).

[2] Cullmann, Les Premières Confessions de la foi Chretienne, pp. 13-27. Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1960), pp. 13-29.

Feine preceded Cullmann in suggesting that the liturgical setting and exorcism were among the occasions

But Bultmann contends that exorcism and persecution need not have motivated formulation or use of credal formulae unlike the other options suggested by Cullmann.[1] With regard to persecution, it seems that there must have been need for succinct formulation of basic faith motifs to suit a strong apologetic and kerygmatic intent to meet this urgent situation; the properly apologetic phrase would have differentiated the formula for a persecution situation from that more suited to the 'within-church' (innerkirchliche) circumstances, with, of course, probable exception in the formula for polemical use against heretics. While we make this reservation as regards 'persecution,' Bultmann's citation on exorcism does seem pertinent. Among the circumstances suggested by Cullmann, therefore, only baptism and

---

which yielded credal formulations of the proper kinds. Paul Feine, Die Gestalt des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses, pp. 41ff. The basic thesis maintained in this work is that the primary credal form was baptismal confession.

As possible or probable Sitze of the formulae of confessions of faith, Stauffer mentions the following five (Die Theologie des N.Ts., pp. 212ff.):

1) missionary preaching
2) theological instruction
3) administration of baptism
4) communal worship
5) the stream of dogmatic tradition.

Christological formulations such as "Jesus is the Lord" (Rom. 10:9; cf. Eph. 4:5, I Ptr. 3:21f., Acts 8:37--variant reading) are regarded by Stauffer as being confessed by the baptisant at the administration of that rite (ibid., p. 214).

[1] Bultmann in TLZ, LXXIV, 40.

regular worship may be properly regarded as contributing a 'liturgical' nature, in our sense, to the credal formulations, especially as the credal formulae specifically designed for use in relation to these two occasions (i.e., baptism and regular worship) necessarily presuppose a setting for corporate worship. Other circumstances do not seem to have been motivated directly by 'liturgical' purposes. In other words, it seems that the 'liturgical' setting, for which and in which credal formulations were constructed and used, does not necessarily dictate the character of formulae designed for non-liturgical occasions.

As to the representing of 'credal' contents in the form of liturgical formulae what we have said above remains pertinent; that is, the adjective 'credal' can suit a wide range of material, e.g., catechetical formulae, credal formulae in persecution, polemic, credal formulae and proper liturgical formulae. That which is behind all these variants is an early Christian kerygmatic tradition, or an interpretative scheme to set forth the soteriological meaning of the Christ-event. The tradition comes to assume many forms, to meet many needs, all occasioned by situations of worship and preaching in the life of the Church.[1] The 'credal' contents as represented in those varied forms are nothing other than reflections of (essential motifs in the) kerygmatic traditions.

---

[1] Cf. C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p. 8.

The brief observation we made earlier with regard to 'liturgical and/or credal' formulae suggests these two premises as primary in our study:

First, the criteria, to be surveyed in the next section, indicate, so we shall regard, the formulary character in a given passage. We shall limit ourselves to examining passages whose 'liturgical formulary' nature appears self-evident from the Gattung-analytical point of view (i.e., as related to prayer, doxology, eulogy, some sort of liturgical salutation, or Amen).

Secondly, while a passage's concern as credal or hymnodic will not be irrelevant in some cases, this concern will not be treated as the major Gattung-analytical issue in view of other problems noted above. Instead, we will study the theme(s) of the passage, i.e., whether it be theo-logical, Christological or pneumatological.

SECTION 2

Criteria for Detecting the 'Formulary' Material

In this section we briefly survey criteria proposed by scholars; then we hope to indicate those useful in our study and to outline the procedures for applying these criteria.

a) It seems to be Norden's abiding contribution to subsequent N.T. form-critical studies that he has presented the stylistic criteria for detection of the so-called 'religious speech' (religiöse Rede) on the basis of comparative examination of widely ranging Hellenic-Hellenistic and Jewish material and seemingly corresponding materials in the N.T.[1] The criteria proposed by Norden are as follows:

1) sentence construction with relative pronouns,

2) participial construction,

3) homoiokatarkton[2] and homoioteleuton,[3]

4) use of antithetical correlative particles, μέν and δέ.[4]

In addition to these, Norden mentions the parallelismus membrorum[5] and an anaklesis, as represented in the so-called Gloria,[1] as also the stylistic characteristics of the *religiöse Formelsprache*.

---

[1] Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos (4th ed.; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1912).

[2] Homoiokatarkton means two or more clauses or verses which have 'a similar beginning.' Liddell-Scott, p. 1224.

[3] Norden, op. cit., pp. 256 and 266, fn. 1. Homoioteleuton means two or more clauses or verses which have 'a similar ending.' Liddell-Scott, p. 1225.

[4] Norden, op. cit., p. 256.

[5] Ibid., pp. 260-61 and 355-64. Norden distinguishes the Hellenistic parallelismus membrorum from the Semitic one. In his view, the former is based upon a 'principle of formal division,' while the latter, being Semitic, is constructed upon a 'parallel of thought' (Gedankenparallelismus).

On the parallelism in Hebrew poetry, see S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), pp. 362ff.

The first standard (i.e., sentence construction with relative pronouns) and the second standard (i.e., participial construction) are both regarded by Norden as stylistic indications (*Stilsignatur*) of the 'confession of faith.'[2] These first two criteria become cardinal for Norden's study.[3] So far as can be seen, Norden never discusses the *Sitz*-defining, as well as the *Gattung*-analytical, problem involved in distinguishing *religiose Rede*, or *religiose Formelsprache*, from the confession of faith. One assumes that the former category may be inclusive of the latter, despite Norden's failure to offer any explicit definition of the two categories.

---

[1] Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, p. 276. Norden refers to the Gloria, which has been part of the Mass for centuries, and is contained in the Codex Alexandrinus of the O.T. and also in the Book VII of the Apostolic Constitution.

Ἀνάκλησις is a noun form of ἀνακαλέω, and means 'calling on,' 'invocation,' 'address' or 'calling aloud' (Liddell-Scott, p. 108). In the Greek text of the Gloria, it refers to the instances of vocative case (e.g., Κύριε βασιλευ ἐπουρανιε , θέε πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ , κύριε υἱὲ μονογενὴς Ἰησου Χριστί , καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα) and the use of the second person singular (e.g., ὅτι σὺ εἶ μόνος ἅγιος , σὺ εἶ μόνος κύριος).

[2] Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

[3] Cf. Norden, *ibid.*, pp. 380ff.

According to Dibelius's introduction of a study by Kroll, the latter, dependent on Norden's study, suggests the following as stylistic criteria:[1]

1) an elevated prose style,

2) meaningfully divided clauses and phrases,

3) strophic structure with indications of formal connection, and

4) a deliberately rhythmical, but not properly metrical, language.

In the case of a Greek text for a Jewish song book, essential features are, in Kroll's view, those of prose hymns, whose stylistic characteristics are:

1) the parallelismus membrorum,

2) a 'making a perfect sense' of the clauses, sentences and passages,

3) the number of lines (in the case of strophically constructed songs), and

4) a certain rhythm (at least in a form of homotony,[2] and often homoioteleuton).

Dibelius's introduction does not clarify how Kroll evaluates the participial construction and clauses with relative pronouns, which are crucial for Norden's thesis.

---

[1] Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," pp. 221-222. His reference is to J. Kroll, Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Clemens von Alexandria (1921). This work by Kroll has not been available to the present writer.

[2] As a stylistic feature this denotes the lines which have the same accent. Cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 1228.

In view of the alleged dependence on Norden, it may be assumed that the importance of these stylistic features is presumed by Kroll.

Hunter suggests, in relation to his detection of the pre-Pauline material in the Pauline epistles, the following as stylistic criteria:[1]

1) the participial construction,
2) the use of relative pronouns,
3) a certain rhythmical quality,
4) a correspondence between words and phrases,
5) clearly defined strophes,
6) the *parallelismus membrorum*, and
7) *homoioteleuton*.

Most of these are specifically mentioned as stylistic characteristics of the pre-Pauline Christian hymns; the first and the second are, however, noted, in relation to an examination of Rom. 1:3-5, as being "characteristic of the formulary style";[2] a remark to the same effect is made on the *parallelismus membrorum* as represented in Rom. 4:24-25.[3] A fact to be noted with regard to Hunter's presentation is that he includes passages of various kinds under the category of 'formulae' and does not present any discussion on the *Gattung*-analytical problems involved in the distinction he makes between the 'formulae' and the 'hymns,' which he discusses in separate chapters. In other words, Hunter does not clarify whether hymns would be, in view of the stylistic characteristics, formulae or not. It seems that 'formulae' is a much more inclusive term than Hunter seems to allow.

---

[1] A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), p. 38.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Delling defines the Gattung of Eph. 1:17-22 as a piece of hymnodic material. The criteria, which he applies to the passage, are the following:[1]

1) division into three parts,
2) participial construction, and
3) use of relative pronouns.

Delling sees in the last two definite stylistic features of praise to deities, and finds the same features represented in II Cor. 1:3f.; Eph. 1:3 and I Ptr. 1:3. In his evaluation of these two criteria Delling is dependent on Norden's Agnostos Theos.[2] In addition to the three criteria mentioned above, Delling refers to a view held by Raney, who maintains that combination of parallelism, rhythm and poetical beauty (dichterischer Schönheit) strongly indicates an hymnodic character for any given N.T. passage.[1] Raney discerns various schemes in the basic types of parallelism represented in the Fourth Gospel. Delling thinks that these types of parallelism as discerned by Raney are valuable for an analysis of other hymnodic pieces in the N.T.[2] In relation to Delling's presentation, it is noteworthy that he deals, as we have noted elsewhere, with the confession of faith and the hymn in the same chapter. This seems to be based on his assumption that, first, the latter (i.e., hymn) often has 'credal' character, since it is concerned with presenting, in literally 'refined' sentences, the praise of God's redemptive work in Jesus Christ,[3] and secondly, the form of expression of the 'credal' contents is not limited to the hymn alone.[4] As a matter of course, he does not present any Gattung-analytical criteria to distinguish confession from hymn.

---

[1] G. Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., p. 83. He compares there the Ephesian passage with a hymnodic prayer of Apuleius.

[2] Ibid., p. 67, fn. 36.

In addition to these criteria, we now have a notable suggestion made by Schattenmann in his recent work.[5]

---

[1] Delling, Der Gottesdienst . . ., p. 87. Delling's reference is made to W. H. Raney, The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Christian Cults (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933).

[2] Delling, loc. cit. [3] Ibid., p. 85.

[4] Cf. ibid., p. 77.

[5] Johannes Schattenmann, Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965).

In one of the footnotes attached to the work Schattenmann maintains, in accordance with Schneider,[1] "In the course of Hellenism the metrical poetry is gradually replaced by rhythmical poetry, which, regardless of quantity, takes into account only the number of syllables."[2] Schattenmann's work deals with the number of syllables, and such clues as strophic division and rhyme, in the examination of prose hymns in the N.T., and other writings. The number of syllables may prove in itself to be a useful criterion, especially in determining the extent of redactoral additions in passages with an almost even syllabic structure.

Are there criteria specifically suited to credal formulae as distinguished from formulary material? We have seen how Norden designates the participial construction and the relative construction as two criteria also applicable to credal formulae. Norden would imply that he can somehow distinguish liturgical material from the credal one. As we also note, however, Norden fails to elaborate this distinction, nor does he discuss the complex Gattung-analytical problems involved in making such a distinction.

---

[1] A reference is made by Schattenmann to Carl Schneider, Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentum (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954), Vol. II, p. 51. Cf. pp. 50-73.

[2] Schattenmann, Studien zum neutestamentlichen . . ., p. 3, fn. 1.

Here one may turn to Stauffer, who presents sundry criteria specifically applicable to detection of formulary confessional material (formelhafte Glaubensgut).[1] The twelve read as follows:

1) 'framework terminology' (Rahmenterminologie), being the most surely indicative (i.e., "to transmit," "to believe," "to confess");

2) contextual dislocation indicating the presence of formula;[2]

3) syntactical disparity within a given context;

4) differences in linguistic features and/or terminology, and/or style within a given context;

5) repetition of creed-like contents in varying passages;

---

[1] E. Stauffer, Die Theologie des N.Ts. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1945), p. 322.

[2] This feature has been called (context-analytical) aporia. Aporia means 'difficulty of passing' or 'being at a loss' or 'perplexity' (Liddell-Scott, p. 215). When the word is used as a technical term in the realm of literary criticism, it denotes the disruption of smooth flowing of thought in a given context. Aporia has been taken up as one of the literary critical criteria for the study of the Fourth Gospel by E. Schwartz, "Aporien im vierten Evangelium," Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenhschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1907, pp. 342-72; 1908, pp. 115-188 and 497-650.

Schwartz' study has been recently taken up by R. T. Fortna in his unpublished dissertation, "The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Chief Narrative Source used by the Fourth Evangelist" (U.T.S.: Th.D. Dissertation, 1965), p. 54, fn. 5 and pp. 66ff.

Dr. J. Louis Martyn has kindly introduced me to the term aporia and to the two works mentioned above.

6) simple, clear syntactical structures (i.e., avoidance of articles, conjunctions, for complex sentence structure; preference for parataxis over hypotaxis);

7) a so-called 'monumental stylistic structure' (i.e., preference for antithetical or anaphorical[1] style);

8) rhythmical form;

9) arrangement in lines and strophes;

10) partiality in favour of noun predicates and appositions;

11) partiality toward participles and relative pronouns;

12) a normative manner in referring to elementary truths and facts of Heilsgeschichte.

Among the twelve criteria, numbers two, three, ten and especially eleven are also applicable to liturgical formulae. The sixth,[2] seventh and eighth are appropriate criteria for liturgical materials such as hymnodic formulae. Number twelve may be taken as also applicable to eulogical forms and hymnodic materials.[1] Thus we are left with the first and fifth criteria in detecting material that are credal. Yet these criteria are to be employed with caution, since they are not necessarily absolute *Gattung*-analytical criteria. Our remark may be clarified in the following observation, for example: as to the first criterion, one can refer to Phil. 2:11. It is readily to be admitted that what follows the notable 'framework term' (*Rahmenterminus*) ἐξομολογήσηται (ὅτι) at the verse is of credal nature (ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ). But this does not mean that ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ constitutes an independent unit in its proper *Gattung*; rather, in the given context, it serves as part of a larger unit, of which *Gattung* would seem to be properly hymnodic.[2] Again, with regard to the fifth criterion, one might indicate the correspondence between I Peter 2:21-24 and 3:18-22.[3] Both are Christological in their subject,

---

[1] As a technical term of rhetorics, ἀναφορά means a repetition of a word (Liddell-Scott, p. 125). Stylistically speaking, it means a similarity of the word at the beginning of sentences (Blass-Debrunner, 489--p. 314). Proper examples may be found in Heb. 11:3-31 (Blass-Debrunner, §491--p. 315).

[2] Cf. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, p. 13. Kelly thinks that the context, rhythm and general pattern, as well as the contents, of any given passage may betray its credal-formulary character.

---

[1] Delling, *Der Gottesdienst im N.T.*, p. 83,

[2] Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus* (*SHAW*, 2nd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961), *passim*. Also Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, pp. 39-44 and 122-123.

An excellent survey and analysis of the critical problems of the Philippians passage are given in R. P. Martin, *An Early Christian Confession* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960). Martin seems to be inclined to argue that the Philippians passage is not an outright quotation of a hymn, but is to be attributed to Paul's theological-literary ingenuity.

[3] Cf. e.g., M. -E. Boismard, *Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre*, p. 111.

Especially the orderly arrangement of the contents in the latter passage will give a strong 'credal' impression. There are, however, two problems present: first, the credal character of the latter passage may not necessarily coincide with the proper Gattung of the passage. The correspondence with the former passage, 2:21-24, may not necessarily imply that the former is also 'credal' in nature.

Dibelius's remark on I Tim. 3:16 seems to be worthy of note. It is Dibelius's view that in the passage there is clear representation of an hymnodic prose style.[1] That which, in Dibelius's view, favours an hymnodic character in the passage rather than its being a credal formula is its "fully unsystematic arrangement of part" (völlig unsystematische Anordnung der Glieder), which is based upon a contrast of the heavens and the world, and not upon a chronological schema.[2] In other words, a systematic chronological arrangement of certain 'credal' contents may be taken as a criterion for the character of the passage as a confessional formula. Dibelius's view may be relevant to the question at issue: whether a given (Christological) passage can be properly a hymn or, rather, a formulary confession of faith.

---

[1] Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," p. 222. Cf. M. Dibelius-H. Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe (HNT, 3rd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1955), pp. 49-50. In the commentary a basically same view to that in the article is reaffirmed. At the same time, the division of the passage into three pairs of rhythmically similar lines (ibid.   , p. 49) and a certain hymnodic character (compared to Ode of Solomon 19:8ff., ibid., p. 50) are noted.

[2] The discernment of a Christ-hymn in I Tim. 3:16 is maintained e.g., by J. Jeremias (Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, NTD, 7th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954, pp. 21-24), M. -E. Boismard (Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre, pp. 60-61), and E. Lohmeyer (Kyrios Jesus, esp. p. 55). Cf. O. Cullmann, Die Christologie des N.Ts. (2nd

To sum up: there are, as Stauffer suggests, some criteria that are applicable to 'credal' formulae; however, none of them may be regarded as applicable exclusively to this type of formulary material; rather, most of these criteria are to be regarded as indicative generally of 'liturgical and/or credal' formulary material as we defined elsewhere. A properly 'credal' character of any given passage may be admitted on the basis of a presentation of the thematic elements which come to be formulated later into various creeds, as well as on the basis of the criteria suggested e.g., by Stauffer.

The criteria suggested by the scholars may be classified roughly as follows:

A. stylistic criteria in general:
  1. elevated prose style.
  2. certain rhythm.

---

ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1958), p. 230.

Norden is in agreement with the exegetes who define the Gattung of I Tim. 3:16 as a 'liturgical formula of confession' (Agnostos Theos, p. 255; cf. pp. 254-257).

3. a correspondence between words and phrases.

4. a combination of parallelism, rhythm and poetical beauty.

5. differences in linguistic features, terminology and style in a given context.

6. a repetition of creed-like contents in different passages.

B. stylistic criteria from a viewpoint of structure:

7. meaningfully divided clauses and phrases.

8. the number of lines (in the case of strophically divided ones).

9. clearly defined strophes.

10. number of syllables.

11. a preference of antithetical or anaphorical style.

C. stylistic criteria in particular:

1. vocabulary:

12. the so-called 'framework term.'

2. grammatical and syntactical ones:

13. relative construction.

14. participial construction.

15. an avoidance of articles, conjunction.

16. a preference of noun predicates and appositions.

3. features of stylistic refinement:

17. homoiokatrkton and homoioteleuton.

18. antithetical particles, μέν and δέ .

19. the parallelismus membrorum.

20. homotony.

21. (anaklesis).

4. context-analytical criterion:

22. the context-analytical aporia.

5. contents:

23. the normative manner of speaking about the essential truths and facts of Heilsgeschichte.

b) These criteria suggested by the scholars appear to be pertinent to our detecting and defining the formulary material in I Peter; none of these needs, so it seems to us, to be rejected, while we shall take the context-analytical aporia as one of the steps for examining the traditional material (See Section 3).[1] Since no single criterion is strong enough to detect and define, one may appeal to the force of cumulative evidence of two or more of these criteria. Furthermore, these criteria need to be applied to any given passage according to a certain exegetical procedure, which we shall outline presently.

---

[1] Supplementary considerations will be suggested at a relevant point of our study.

SECTION 3

An Outline of the Procedure for Examining the Formulary Material

We shall outline here an exegetical procedure by which to detect and to examine the traditional formulary material as represented in I Peter.

First, especially with regard to the traditonal formulary material incorporated into the texture of the epistolary context, we shall enumerate the features which seem to suggest reflection or presence of traditional formulary piece in a given passage. This enumeration will be carried out by noting 1) terminological and other related features which seem to distinguish the passage under consideration from the rest of the Epistle, 2) the context-analytical aporia, 3) the 'formulary' features which seem to correspond to the 'formulary criteria,' which we have listed in preceding Section 2, and 4) the parallel instances found elsewhere in the N.T. When a piece of such material is detected, we shall 1) define the scope of the piece, and 2) try to reconstruct the possible original text of the piece under study. Then we shall ask whether a proper Gattung may be assigned to this piece.

With regard to formulary pieces, the Gattungen of which appear to be self-evident, we shall consider the problem of definition of the Gattung and the problems related to it.

Secondly, we shall examine, from a history-of-tradition point of view, the formulary piece thus detected and defined, by relating the piece (or the segments of it) to its possible N.T. parallels found not only in the Pauline (and deutero-Pauline) epistles but also elsewhere in the N.T.

With regard to the instances which show remarkable affinities, we shall ask whether or not those affinities may be regarded as indicative of direct literary dependence of one upon the other. In the cases of affinities which may not be taken as suggesting a direct literary dependence, we shall ask about the nature of the affinities.

CHAPTER II

A SALUTATION FORMULA IN 1:2[1]

In I Ptr. 1:2 a traditional Christian salutation formula seems to be reflected. The passage which concerns us at present reads as follows:

> χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.
> May grace and peace be multiplied to you (RSV)

SECTION 1

Preliminary Observation

In this section we shall limit ourselves to defining the 'salutation formula.'

By a 'salutation formula' we mean a formulary expression of greetings used either for a liturgical purpose or in the context of an epistolary prescript.[2] The recurring identical or similar structure and wording, as well as the function the salutation is supposed to perform, may be taken as indicative of the 'formulary' character of this expression of greeting.

---

[1] A salutation formula similar to the one we find in 1:2 appears in 5:14. We shall comment on 5:14 later.

[2] Cf. Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 55-56. Delling refers to the view, e.g., held by Cullmann, which regards the salutation formula as we find it in the N.T. epistles as "an introductory formula of the service of worship." To this view we shall return later.

Most of salutation formulae as found in the N.T. are, as we shall see presently, invocations of various divine blessings upon someone. In this sense, the formulae are religious in character, and they would properly be termed benedictions. Structurally and functionally speaking, however, many N.T. salutation formulae have parallels in non-Christian profane, as well as in Christion, epistolary prescripts.[1] Therefore, the somewhat general term, 'salutation formula,' will serve better, so it seems, for our present purpose of examination.

SECTION 2

Examination of the Salutation Formula in I Ptr. 1:2

In this section we shall limit ourselves to taking up the following two questions:

1. What we have in I Ptr. 1:2 is an epistolary salutation formula. Can we regard it as literally dependent upon the similar formulae in Pauline (-deutero-Pauline) epistles?

2. Is it possible that N.T. epistolary salutation formulae might originally have been liturgical formulae?

---

[1] Cf. Otto Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), pp. 61-62 and 110-112. Cf. notes 264-275 (pp. 447-459).

If so, does the place of those formulae in the epistles have any bearing, as some scholars suggest, upon our knowing the actual structure of primitive Christian worship?

A. In this sub-section we shall be concerned with the first question, i.e., whether the epistolary salutation formula in I Ptr. 1:2 may be regarded as dependent upon the Pauline ones.

(a) According to the division made by Roller, who has made an extensive comparative examination of the epistolary forms in the Hellenic-Hellenistic literature and in the N.T., especially those in Pauline writings,[1] what we call an 'epistolary salutation formula' is named _Salutatio_; this, along with _Superscriptio_ (or _Intitulatio_) and _Adscriptio_, forms a prescript, or _Eingangsprotokoll_. For our present concern _Superscriptio_ and _Adscriptio_ may be set aside. For the purpose of illustration, instances of the _Salutatio_ as we find it in N.T. epistolary writings will be listed below. With regard to the enumeration and order of 'Pauline' epistles, we shall follow Roller's tabulation.[2]

---

[1] Roller, _Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe_, e.g., pp. 57ff.

[2] _Ibid._, Table 3 (one of the sheets appended to the work).

Instances of the Salutatio in the Pauline epistles:

I Thess. 1:1, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη .[1]

II Thess. 1:2, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς[2] καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . .

Gal. 1:3-5, χαρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς (ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου)[3] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ[4] τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ (αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος)[5] πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

I Cor. 1:3, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

II Cor. 1:2 (identical with I Cor. 1:3).

Rom. 1:7, (χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη)[6] ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Phil. 1:2, (identical with I Cor. 1:3).

Phm. 1:2, (identical with I Cor. 1:3).

---

[1] So B G pc lat sy^{p}. ℵ A I 𝔎(D) pl sy^{h} add ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[2] So B D 33 pc. ℵ A. I 𝔎 G pl lat sy add ἡμῶν.

[3] So ℌ 1912 al. p^{46} p^{51} B 𝔎 D G al have καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν . 4 has καὶ κυρίου.

[4] So p^{51} B H 23 1611 pm. p^{46} ℵ* A D G al have περί.

[5] H 𝔎 D G pl. have ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος.

[6] sy^{p} has εἰρήνη καὶ χάρις ὑμῖν.

Col. 1:2, χαρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).[1]

Eph. 1:2 (identical with I Cor. 1:3).

Titus 1:4, χάρις (καὶ)[2] εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ (Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ)[3] τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.

I Tim. L:2, χάρις ,ἔλεος , εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς (ἡμῶν)[4] καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

II Tim. 1:2, χάρις , ἔλεος , εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ(Χριστου Ἰησοῦ)[5] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

Instances of the Salutatio in the non-Pauline epistles:

Heb. (no epistolary prescript).

Jas. 1:1, χαίρειν.

I Ptr. 1:2, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.

---

[1] The phrase καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is omitted in B D pm it vg^{codd} sy Or. ℵ A C I ℜ G al it vg^{cl} include the phrase.

[2] Ἔλεος is a substitute for καὶ in Aℜ pl. Ἔλεος καὶ is found in 1739 sy^{h}.

[3] Pℜ G pl f vg sy add κυρίου.

[4] ℜ pm sy Ambst include ἡμῶν.

[5] ℵ* 33 69 pc (sy^{p}) have κυρίου Ἰησου Χριστοῦ.

II Ptr. 1:2, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ)[1] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

I Jn. (no salutation formula. Cf. 1:4, καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.

II Jn. 3, ἔσται μεθ᾽ (ἡμῶν)[2] χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη παρὰ θεοῦ πατρός, καὶ παρὰ[3] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἀληθεία καὶ ἀγάπη.

Jude 2, ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

Rev. 1:4-5, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ[4] ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων (ἅ)[5] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος[6] τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς.

In addition to these instances, the Salutatio in the Apostolic decree (Acts 15:23, χαίρειν) is to be noted; this Salutatio is paralleled only in Jas. 1:1.[1]

---

[1] The phrase τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ is omitted in PΨ(al) vg^{codd}. Χριστοῦ is affixed to Ἰησοῦ in ℵ A L pm (ʃ 33 al vg^{cl}). Χριστοῦ is omitted in B C 𝔎 pc.

[2] Ὑμῶν, instead of ἡμῶν, is found in K 69 pm. lat sy^{h}.

[3] Κυρίου is inserted after παρά in ℵ 𝔎 al sy^{h}.

[4] Θεοῦ is inserted between ἀπό and ὁ in 𝔎 al t Prim. Τῶν is a substitute for ἅ in ℵ A 2036 pc. is used in C 𝔎 pl. Neither τῶν nor ἅ appear in 2037.

[5] Ἐστίν is inserted between ἅ and ἐνώπιον in P 1 pm.

[6] Ἐκ is inserted between πρωτότοκος and τῶν in 1 al.

(b) The view that regards the formula in I Ptr. 1:2 as dependent on the Salutatio of the Pauline epistles is represented e.g., by Holtzmann,[2] Roller,[3] Barnett,[4] Beare,[5] Delling,[6] Schelkle[7] and others.[8]

---

[1] Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe, p. 133, notes the structural and terminological (e.g., χαίρειν) similarities shared by Acts 15:23 and Jas. 1:1, and notes the differences between these two passages and the prescripts in the Pauline epistles. Roller regards the Apostolic decree (Acts 15:23-29) and the Epistle of James older than Pauline epistles, while the latter belong to the oldest of Christian epistolary writings.

[2] Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das N.T., p. 314.

[3] Roller, op. cit., pp. 62 and 132.

[4] Barnett, Paul Becomes A Literary Influence, p. 53.

[5] Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 47.

[6] Delling in TWNT, VI, 282.

[7] Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe . . ., p. 23.

[8] O. D. Foster, The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter" (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913), pp. 437 and 442. In view of 'contextual reasons,' Foster is inclined to maintain that the Petrine Salutatio is dependent on Eph. 1:2, not on Rom. 1:7. It may be noted that Foster's comparison is limited to the phrase χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ; no discussion is given of πληθυνθείη (I Ptr. 1:2; II Ptr. 1:2; Jude 3) nor of the absence of theo-logical and Christological references, as often found in Pauline Salutatio, from the Petrine one.

Von Soden admits that the Petrine Salutatio follows the Pauline one closely, but he leaves the question open whether the Salutatio was originally formulated by Paul himself (then taken up by I Peter) or whether the Salutatio was already a formula current in the Church prior to Paul's writings (Hans von Soden, Der erste Brief des Petrus, HCNT, 3rd ed.; Freiburg/ Leipzig/ Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1898, Vol. III, While scholars like Beare and Schelkle make reservations about πληθυνθείη ,[1] they all note the close terminological resemblance which the formula in I Ptr. 1:2 has to the Pauline, namely, as to the phrase χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη . Beare, for instance, thinks that the phrasing 'grace and peace from God the Father' appears to be "almost the hallmark" of the Pauline epistles; since there is no piece of evidence for the fact that this phrasing had established itself in common Christian usage, "we are obliged to see," so thinks Beare, "direct and deliberate literary dependence upon the Pauline phrasing whenever the phrasing is found."[2]

On the other hand, the view that regards the Petrine Salutatio as not dependent on Pauline formula is represented e.g., by Hort,[3] Knopf,[4] Blenkin[5] and

---

p. 129). The succinct formulation of the Salutatio suggests to Von Soden that the motifs such as 'grace' and 'peace' were well known to the readers; neither Paul nor Peter should be regarded, so thinks Von Soden, as the first ones to ascribe dogmatic implication to these two motifs.

[1] The word πληθυνθείη is regarded by Beare (The First Epistle of Peter, p. 47) and by Schelkle (Die Petrusbriefe . . ., p. 23) as having been derived from the LXX (Dan. 3:98; 4:34c).

[2] Beare, loc. cit.

[3] F. J. A. Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 25.

[4] R. Knopf, Die Briefe Petri und Judae, p. 37.

[5] G. W. Blenkin, The First Epistle General of Peter (CGTCS; Cambridge: The University Press, 1914), p. 17.

Schneider.[1] In his early writing Delling also maintained this view.[2] Scholars like Blenkin and Schneider admit that the phrasing χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη is regularly used in Pauline epistles; however, the apparent verbal similarity is not regarded by them as evidence for Petrine dependence. The following points are noted by these scholars in support of the view that the Petrine Salutatio may not be dependent on the Pauline.

1. The Petrine Salutatio deviates from the Pauline, especially with regard to the use of πληθυνθείη. (Knopf, Delling, Schneider).

2. The ultimate origin of the combination of χάρις and εἰρήνη is to be sought, not in Pauline writings, but in the so-called Aaronic Benediction (Num. 6: 24-26) (Hort, Blenkin).[3]

The points noted by the two divergent positions may be summed up in the following two basic questions:

First, is it altogether certain that it was Paul who originally composed the Salutatio as found in his epistles? Since the Pauline epistles are among the earliest in Christian epistolary literature, if this question is answered affirmatively, the verbal coincidence in I Ptr. 1:2, as well as the literary function of the Segenwunsch as an epistolary Salutatio, will have to be explained, so it would seem, in terms of its literary dependence upon the Pauline.

---

[1] Johannes Schneider, Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes, p. 44.

[2] G. Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 55-56 (fn. 33).

[3] This point is also upheld by Hart (J. H. A. Hart, The First Epistle General of Peter, Vol. V of The Expositor's Greek Testament, New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1910), p. 41. Hart bases his view on the consideration that, in view of Gal. 6:16, it appears presumable that "ἔλεος stood originally in the place which χάρις usurped," and the source of it would be the Aaronic Benediction.

Secondly, how are the differences between the Petrine Salutatio and the Pauline ones to be explained?

(c) Let us take up the first question.

As the cautious remark by Roller reminds us, it is not absolutely certain that the Pauline epistles are the earliest Christian writings, since one may, with Roller,[1] regard the Apostolic decree and perhaps James[2] as the very earliest. There are, however, two things yet to be noted: 1) the Salutatio in Acts 15:23 and Jas. 1:3 (χαίρειν) follows exactly the commonest form of the Hellenic-Hellenistic Salutatio, and has parallels neither among the Pauline epistles nor in I Ptr. 1:2; 2) the Petrine Salutatio shares obvious verbal coincidence with that of the Pauline epistles, which are, as we have remarked, certainly among the earliest of the epistolary writings.

---

[1] Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe, p. 133.

[2] Ibid.

Thus it would seem that an inherent possibility remains in the view that the Petrine *Salutatio* is dependent literarily upon the Pauline, at least with regard to the exact wording χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Nevertheless, the view seems questionable. Lohmeyer has challenged its possibility,[1] and his challenge seems not to have been met successfully even by Friedrich's protest.[2]

Lohmeyer's view may be summed up in the following two lines of consideration. The first is a literary-critical (form-critical) one. Lohmeyer notes the literary refinement of the Pauline *Salutatio* in the absence of definite articles[3] and in the neat three-line division,[4] and regards the refinement as suggesting that the *Salutatio* was composed and used as an introit in primitive Christian worship.[1] The phrasing and especially the combination of theo-logical and Christological references do not appear to Lohmeyer as peculiarly Pauline.

---

[1] E. Lohmeyer, "Briefliche Grussüberschriften" in *Probleme paulinischer Theologie* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, n.d.), pp. 7-29. The article was originally published in *ZNW*, XXVI (1927), 158-173.

[2] Gerhard Friedrich, "Lohmeyers These über 'Das paulinische Briefpraskript' kritisch beleuchtet," *ZNW*, XXXXVI (1955), 272-274. Friedrich's main contention is that Lohmeyer's view of the *Salutatio* as being originally a liturgical formula is unwarranted.

[3] This feature is noted, along with the absence of personal pronoun (e.g., ἡμῶν), with regard to the Christological references in I Cor. 8:6; 12:3 and Phil. 2:11, all of which are regarded by Lohmeyer as representing 'traditional formula of confession' (Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 19).

[4] The three-line division seen by Lohmeyer is as follows:

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη
ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

On the other hand, the use of 'peace' in the context of Segenwunsch strongly suggests to Lohmeyer a relationship between the Salutatio and the customary Jewish greeting שָׁלוֹם.

Against this line of consideration, Friedrich maintains as follows:

First, Lohmeyer's view of the non-use of definite articles appears unwarranted, since the non-use is explicable from the absence of an article with εἰρήνη, which does not, as a rule, take an article in the context of a Segenwunsch; that absence regulates the use or non-use of articles with the rest of the Salutatio.

Secondly, the combination of 'God' and 'Christ' is not so uncustomary with Paul as Lohmeyer thinks (cf. I Thess. 1:1; 3:11; II Thess. 1:1, 12; 2:16; Gal. 1:1).

Thirdly, the non-liturgical character of the Salutatio is borne out by Paul's use of a shortened form of it in I Thess. 1:1 and also by the difference between the Salutatio and the 'liturgical' Eschatokoll,[2] or

---

[1] Lohmeyer, "Briefliche Grussüberschriften," p. 14.

[2] This term is employed by Roller (Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe, pp. 68ff.) in the sense of a postscript.

'concluding salutation,' of the Pauline epistles.

Now, Friedrich's criticism of Lohmeyer will be taken up point by point:

First, Friedrich's view of the non-use of the article may be explicable in part by the so-called Apollonius' canon.[1] The anarthrous κύριος, however, seems also explicable from the 'modification of Appolonius' canon,' i.e., κύριος may have attained almost a status of a proper noun in early Christian usage.[2] The anarthrous θεός may likewise be explained in this way.[3] This 'modified' Apollonius' canon would seem to explain the anarthrous Christological formulations, e.g., in I Cor. 12:3 and Phil. 2:11 as adduced by Lohmeyer (cf. I Cor. 8:6); both of these formulations appear to be close reproductions of 'pre-Pauline'[4] credal motifs.

---

[1] Moule quotes Middleton's quotation of the canon as follows: "Nouns in regimen (i.e., 'the condition both of the governing and governed noun') must have articles prefixed to _both_ of them or _neither_." (Italics, Moule's.) C. F. D. Moule, _An Idiom Book of N.T. Greek_ (2nd ed.; Cambridge: The University Press, 1959), p. 114. Also Nigel Turner, _A Grammar of N.T. Greek_, Vol. III: Syntax (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 174.

[2] Moule, _op. cit._, p. 115.

[3] Turner, _loc. cit._ Cf. Moule, _loc. cit._

[4] We shall follow Hunter hereafter in taking 'pre-Pauline' in the sense of the "'twilight period' between the rise of the Christian church and the decade in which Paul's extant letters were written." (A. M. Hunter, _Paul and His Predecessors_, 2nd ed.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961, p. 9).

On I Cor. 12:3, cf. O. Cullmann, _Les Premières_

Secondly, Friedrich is certainly right in noting that in the Pauline epistles there are some instances of the combination of 'God' and 'Christ.' This would not seem to prove automatically, however, that the combination originated in Paul's own theological-literary ingenuity. Rather, on the contrary, Paul's concise and matter-of-fact manner of linking these theo-logical and Christological references together may suggest that the combination was already a well known commonplace of theological assertion in the earliest Gentile churches.[1]

With regard to the third point, to assume the originally liturgical character of the _Salutatio_ would not necessitate the presupposition that the alleged original formula was already verbally fixed, having both theo-logical and Christological references. And so far as its literary character is concerned, there seems

---

Confessions de foi Chretienne (2nd ed.; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948), pp. 22-23. Also H. Lietzmann- W. G. Kümmel, _An die Korinther_ (_HNT_, 4th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1949), p. 61. Cf. Matt. 10:17-20 and Martyr. Plyc. 9:3.

On Phil. 2: (6-)11, cf. e.g., E. Lohmeyer, _Kyrios Jesus_ (2nd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961), esp. p. 73. Also R. P. Martin, _An Early Christian Confession_ (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), _passim_.

[1] On I Thess. 3:11 (-13) and II Thess. 1:12, cf. M. Dibelius, _An die Thessalonischer I II; an die Philipper_ (_HNT_; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1911), pp. 15 and 28.

On Gal. 1:1, W. Bousset, _Der Brief an die Galater_, Vol. II of _Die Schriften des N.Ts._ (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), pp. 33-34. Also H. Schlier, _Der Brief and die Galater_ (_KEK_, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 7.

to be no essential difference between the Salutatio and the 'concluding salutation,' to which Friedrich ascribes a 'liturgical' character.

Furthermore, Friedrich appears to owe us an explanation of the similarity between the Salutatio and the traditional and customary שָׁלוֹם -greeting.

Thus, as a whole, Friedrich's criticism of Lohmeyer's view of literary-critical (form-critical) problems seems not to diminish the cogency of the basic tenets of the latter.

The second line of consideration carried out by Lohmeyer is a history-of-tradition one. The Christological references as found both in the Pauline Salutatio and in I Cor. 8:6; 12:3; Phil. 2:11, or the ascription of the κύριος -title to Christ, are regarded by Lohmeyer as the "oldest material of primitive Christianity," which was influenced by the apocalyptic view of history in Judaism.[1] As to the phrase 'God the Father,' Lohmeyer thinks, in view of the Aramaic expression 'Abba Father' (Rom. 8:16; Gal. 4:6), that the phrase is the "old confession of the Palestinian Christian community (Christusglaubigen)."[2] In short, the theo-logical and Christological references found in the Pauline Salutatio are regarded by Lohmeyer as having originated in the primitive Christian community, and not in Paul's own theological ingenuity.

---

[1] Lohmeyer, "Briefliche Grussüberschriften," p. 21.

[2] Ibid., p. 25. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "Kennzeichen der ipsissima vox Jesu" in Synoptische Studien (Wikenhauser--Festschrift; München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953), pp. 86-93; esp. pp. 86-89.

As to this history-of-tradition observation, Friedrich does not voice any explicit criticism. One may assume that he accepts Lohmeyer's observation. Lohmeyer's view of the possible origin of the ascription of the κύριος-title to Christ in the Palestinian pre-Pauline Christian community has been affirmed e.g., by R. Fuller,[1] and O. Cullmann.[2] The judcious and well-informed discussion by Hahn,[3] who is not necessarily in complete agreement with Cullmann, comes to conclude that concise Christological appellations such as ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς[4] or ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστός[5] as found in the Pauline epistles, especially in their prescripts,

---

[1] R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (SBT; Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956), pp. 111-114.

[2] Oscar Cullmann, Die Christologie des N.Ts. (2nd ed.; J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1958), pp. 200-244.

[3] Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), pp. 67-125.

[4] Rom. 4:24; I Cor. 5:4b; 9:1b, etc. Hahn, op. cit., p. 110, fn. 1.

[5] Rom. 16:18. Also ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Rom. 1:4; 15:6; I Cor. 1:9, 10. Cf. I Cor. 1:2. Hahn, loc. cit.

Proemium[1] and postscripts, are clear traces of the influence of Palestinian tradition.[2] Bultmann, who looks for the origin of the κύριος-title in the Hellenistic community, comes to the conclusion that Paul's use of κύριος as ascribed to Christ is dependent upon pre-Pauline usage,[3] and sees traces of the usage in 1) the traditional Christological references found in Phil. 2:6-11; Rom. 10:9; I Cor. 12:3, etc., in 2) the passage which reflects the cultic connotation of the κύριος-title (I Cor. 1:2, going back to the LXX version of Joel 2:32. Cf. II Tim. 2:22; Acts 9:14, 21; 22:16), and in 3) the introductory salutation formulae as found in the Pauline epistles.[4] For our present concern it will suffice to note with these scholars that concise Christological appellations as found in the Pauline Salutatio need not be regarded as originating in Paul's theologico-literary ingenuity, but in pre-Pauline tradition, of which a close tie with Palestinian primitive Christianity seems to be suggested by the

---

[1] Proemium means the opening words of the main body of the epistolary writing. We shall return to this term in the next chapter.

[2] Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, esp. pp. 109-112.

[3] Rudolf Bultmann, Theologie des N.Ts. (3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1958), p. 127.

[4] Ibid., pp. 127-128.

Marana-tha prayer (I Cor. 16:22. Cf. Rev. 22:20; Did. 10:6).[1]

As to the theo-logical appellation 'God the Father,' Lohmeyer's reference to 'Abba-Father!' (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6) appears to be more than suggestive of the origin of this particular appellation in the Palestinian primitive Christian community, although 1) it seems clear that, as the combination of *Abba* and ὁ πατήρ suggests, the appellation had already found acceptance in the Greek-speaking community,[2] and 2) it appears uncertain whether the pre-Pauline form of the appellation existed as an exuberant *liturgical* cry in primitive Christian worship[3] or as a reference to the opening address of the Lord's Prayer,[4] which may have been used liturgically.

---

[1] Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, pp. 100-106. As to the possible connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, see Hans Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1955), pp. 230-238.

[2] Cf. Ernest De Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistleto the Galatians* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 224.

[3] Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*KEK*, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 168-169. Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (*KEK*; 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 140, fn. 1. Pierre Bonnard, *L'Epître de Sainte Paul aux Galates* (*CNT*; Neuchatel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1953), p. 88.
Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (*HNT*; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1906), p. 43. Kittel in *TWNT*, I, 5-6.

[4] Grundmann in *TWNT*, III, 903. O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship* (*SBT*, E.T. by A. S. Todd & J. B.

From a history-of-tradition point of view, therefore, the theo-logical and Christological references found in the Pauline *Salutatio* would seem, as Lohmeyer has suggested, to go back to pre-Pauline (Palestinian primitive Christian) tradition.[1] Needless to say, such a history-of-tradition consideration does not exclude the possibility that, while Paul is drawing upon traditional theo-logical and Christological appellations, he could have been the first to utilize these appellations in the context of the *Salutatio*.

The first question we have posited above may be answered tentatively as follows: the possibility of Pauline originality as to the *Salutatio* would appear to be lessened by the literary-critical (form-critical) and history-of-tradition considerations; nonetheless, the two possibilities remain in force; i.e., the exact wording χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη as the component of the *Salutatio* may first have been formulated by Paul, and the theo-logical and Christological references may have been put into the context of the Salutatio first by Paul.

(d) Now we come to the second question of how the differences between the Petrine *Salutatio* and the Pauline one(s) are to be explained. There are two notable differences: the first is the absence of theological and Christological references from the Petrine Salutatio; the second is the use, in the Petrine Salutatio, of πληθυνθείη , which is nowhere found in a Pauline Salutatio.

---

[1] Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Vater-unser* (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), p. 25.

As to the absence of theo-logical and Christological references, this seems very difficult to explicate from the position that assumes Petrine acquaintance with the examples of the Pauline Salutatio--except with I Thess. 1:1, the simplest and probably the earliest Pauline Salutatio. It would be possible to maintain that, while the Petrine writer knew the fuller form of the Pauline Salutatio, he substituted πληθυνθείη for the theo-logical and Christological appellations. So far as I Peter as a whole is concerned, it seems there is nothing to explain what caused the alleged substitution or why the substitution was necessary.[1] The substitution-hypothesis seems, therefore, nothing more than a guess.

It still appears possible to maintain that our Petrine writer was acquainted with I Thess. 1:1, if one assumes that the Thessalonians Salutatio known to the writer was a shorter one.[2] If so, verbal coincidence and brevity would seem explicable by the alleged acquaintance; πληθυνθείη would be a mark of our Petrine writer's literary artisanship. However, this possibility seems lessened by a parallel to the use of πληθυνθείη ; to this parallel will we now turn.

---

[1] So far as we know, no cogent explanation in this regard is presented by those who assume a direct literary dependence on the side of the Petrine Salutatio upon Pauline ones.

[2] We have noted elsewhere textual variations on I Thess. 1:1.

Πληθυνθείη is found in Dan. 4:1; 6:26 (LXX. Theod.); the text of these two passages reads: εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη . Dan 4:37c (LXX) reads similarly: εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ . The context of these passages is noteworthy: the formulae in Dan. 4:1 (Theod.) and 4:37c constitute the Salutatio of a decree issued by King Nebuchadnezzar; the formula in 6:26 (Theod.) forms the Salutatio of a decree issued by King Darius. A similar expression is found in B. Sanh. 11b; there Rabbi Gamariel II (ca. A.D. 90) uses an expression שְׁלַמְכוֹן יִשְׂגֵא as the Salutatio in official correspondence.[1] This notable use of πληθυνθείη is nowhere attested in Hellenic-Hellenistic literature or in Pauline epistles (cf. II Cor. 10:9, where πληθύνω is used in an active sense); and the parallels in Later Jewish-Rabbinic literature would seem to bring us to the conclusion that, as to the use of εἰρήνη (ὑμῖν) and πληθυνθείη , the Petrine Salutatio may be closely related to Jewish parallels represented in the instances cited above.[1] Thus it seems unnecessary to postulate a direct literary dependence upon the Pauline *Salutatio*. Yet the addition of χάρις to the customary formula remains to be explained, and the explanation of this addition brings us to the following discussion.

---

[1] Delling in TWNT, VI, 282. See Str.-Bill., I, 154. As to the Rabbinic use of שָׁלוֹם especially in greeting formula, see Foerster in TWNT, II, 407.
The same expression, שְׁלַמְכוֹן יִשְׂגֵא , is found in T.Sanh. 2:6. Concerning Rabbinic parallels of greeting formulae for various occasions, see Foerster, ibid.

(e) A possible parallel to the combination of χάρις and εἰρήνη may be found in the *Salutatio* of the petition for authorization to rebuild the Temple of Yaho (dated 407 B.C.) as found among the Elephantine papyri.

Cf. Str.-Bill., I, 380-385.
There are instances of the use of שלם ושררת שגיא הושרת לך among the Aramaic documents edited by G. R. Driver (*Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* Abridged and revised ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957); those instances are found in Dan. 1:1; 2:1; 5:1 and 13:1 (Driver, *ibid.*, pp. 21, 22 and 37, respectively). In an appended noted on the phrase, Driver refers to the use of שלם (peace) "as a term of greeting as found in the Aram. portions of the O.T. (Ezek. 4:17; 5:7)." (*Ibid.*, p. 44). Driver suggests, in accordance with Rosenthal, that the form of greeting as found in the phrase is "probably of Persian origin."

[1] Delling in *TWNT*, I, 282.

The text reads as follows:

> May God of Heaven seek after the welfare of our lord exceedingly at all times and give you favour before King Darius and the nobles a thousand times more than now. May you be happy and healthy at all times. . . .[1]

In I Enoch 5:7 (Gk.) χάρις and εἰρήνη are combined, along with 'light.'[2] The text reads:

> But for the elect there shall be light and grace (joy) and peace, and they shall inherit the earth.[3]

The combination of χάρις and εἰρήνη here is part of a triadic formulation. The literary character of the context is not a Salutatio, but part of a conspicuous parallelismus membrorum set out in a poetic style.

If one accepts a certain terminological connection between ἔλεος and χάρις, to which we shall return presently, the combination of 'mercy' and 'peace' in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 78:2 may also be noted.[4] 'Mercy and peace' there forms a Salutatio of an epistle sent allegedly by Baruch to "the nine and half tribes, which were across the river Euphratus."[5]

---

[1] J. B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts (2nd ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955) p. 492. I was unable to verify the terms, 'welfare' and 'favour,' in the original text, since the original was not available.

[2] H. Windisch-H. Preisker, Die katholische Briefe (HNT; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1951), p. 52.

[3] Charles, APOT, II, 190. See the footnote on 5:7.

[4] Friedrich, "Lohmeyers these über 'Das paulinische Briefpräskript' kritisch beleuchtet," p. 273.

[5] Charles, op. cit., p. 521.

The parallel in the Aaronic Benediction as pointed out by Hort, Hart and Blenkin seems especially notable. The expression, " The Lord be gracious to you וִיחֻנֶּךָּ, καὶ ἐλεήσαι σε . . . and give you peace וְיָשֵׂם לְךָ שָׁלוֹם, καὶ δῴη σοι εἰρήνην " (Num. 6:25-26), appears in the context of a liturgical formula which becomes a regular part of the liturgies of the Temple worship and synagogue services.[1] The formula appears to have been part of scribal instruction in Tannaitic Judaism.[2] While there seems no clear indication in the N.T., as Delling rightly notes,[3] that the Benediction was used by the early Church, one could presume that the earliest Christians were well acquainted with the Benediction, and that the two key motifs would naturally find their way into a formula used either for a liturgical or for an epistolary purpose. Terminologically speaking, חנן is the verb form of חן, the word most frequently rendered by χάρις in the LXX.[4] The verb חנן is usually translated ἐλεέω , as we have it in Num. 6:25, and this seems to be due to the fact that in the LXX, there is "no analogous verb connected with χάρις ."[1] There are also a few instances of חֶסֶד as rendered by χάρις (Esther 2:9, 17; Ps. 85:11), though חֶסֶד is usually rendered by ἔλεος .[2]

---

[1] Cf. Str.-Bill, Vol. IV, pp. 238-249. Also G. F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), Vol. I, pp. 294-295 and 424-425.

[2] Cf. David Daube, The N.T. and Rabbinic Judaism (London: The Athlone Press, 1956), p. 211.

[3] Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., p. 19.

[4] Cf. Hatch-Redpath, p. 1455.

As to the combination of χάρις and εἰρήνη , therefore, one may say that it is not without parallel, even if the instances are by no means numerous. If these parallels have any positive bearing upon the possible origin or background of the usage of ' χάρις -- εἰρήνη ' , it would seem unnecessary to postulate either the original formulation of the combination by Paul or a Petrine dependence on the alleged formulation.

Now we are, so it seems, in a position to present a brief conclusion to the first two questions which we posited at the outset: can we regard the Petrine *Salutatio* as literally dependent upon that in the Pauline epistles? While, after all, we cannot eliminate the possibility of dependence on the side of the Petrine *Salutatio*, there seem to be literary-critical and history-of-concept factors which lessen the probability of such dependence. Since the possibility of dependence on the side of the Pauline *Salutatio* upon our Petrine

---

[1] Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 25.

[2] Cf. Hatch-Redpath, pp. 451-452.

Salutatio seems almost out of the question,[1] a preferable explanation of the similar literary features shared by the Petrine *Salutatio* and the Pauline one would be that each *Salutatio* was formulated independently of the other, while having probably drawn upon traditional (early Christian) formulae or literary practices influenced primarily by an O.T.-Jewish[2] conceptual (and literary) milieu.[3]

B. Let us briefly look at the second question which we have raised at the outset. This question is twofold: is it possible that N.T. epistolary salutation formulae were originally *liturgical* formulae, and if so, does our understanding of the place of these formulae in the epistles have any dependence upon our knowing the structure of primitive Christian worship?

---

[1] There seem to be three lines of consideration in relation to assuming the priority of the Petrine *Salutatio*: the first is chronological. The internal evidence of I Peter does not warrant the view that dates the epistle prior to, or even along with the earliest of, the Pauline epistles. On this issue, see the judicious discussion carried out e.g., by A. F. Walls in *The First Epistle General of Peter*, commentary by A. M. Stibbs (*The Tyndale N.T. Commentary* series; London: The Tyndale Press, 1962), pp. 49-58 and 66-67. Compare with Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe*, pp. 7-11.

The second one is literary-critical. The non-Pauline πληθυνθείη alone will be strong enough to lessen this possibility.

The third is a history-of-tradition consideration. What has already been said above concerning the possible Petrine dependence will be largely applicable to this possibility.

[2] We shall use 'Jewish' (when it is combined with 'O.T.-') in the sense of '*spätjüdische*.'

[3] Cf. H. von Soden, *Der erste Brief des Petrus*, p. 129.

The discussion carried out in the preceding section (A) seems to lead us to conclude that the _Salutatio_ was not solely dependent on formulae originally designed for a liturgical purpose. As the parallel in the Aaronic Benediction suggests, liturgical formulae of greeting may certainly have been one stratum of the source for the formulation of the _Salutatio_. At the same time, from viewpoints of literary character and terminology, we find parallels in _epistolary_ salutation formulae, and there seems to be good reason to assume that this kind of formula constituted another stratum of the source for the formulation of the N.T. _Salutatio_. Thus in view of the limited evidence available, it is hardly possible to say with certainty which one of the strata directly affected the formulation of the _Salutatio_; this question must remain unsettled.

Now, as to the second phase of the problem, Lohmeyer has assumed, as we have noted elsewhere, that the _Salutatio_ as found in the Pauline epistles (with which he is primarily concerned in his article on the _Salutatio_) was not designed as a _Salutatio_, but was composed originally as an introit of primitive Christian worship.[1] His assumption is based primarily upon what he calls 'solemnity of style.' Lohmeyer's view has been seconded, e.g., by Cullmann,[1] Delling,[2] and Niebergall.[3] In addition to the stylistic consideration taken up by Lohmeyer, these scholars also point out that there are some indications in the Pauline epistles that at least some, if not all, of them were intended to be read aloud in a setting of public assembly, or presumably public worship; certain liturgical formulae were added, so they conjecture, to suit the occasion (I Thess. 5:27; Col. 4:16. Cf. II Cor. 1:13; Eph. 3:4; I Tim. 4:13).[4] This seems to be an important line of consideration, having significance for our defining of the Gattung and Sitz of what seems to be liturgical-formulary material in the epistles, for material of a similar kind in I Peter (e.g., the Salutatio) may also be brought into consideration here.

---

[1] Lohmeyer, "Briefliche Grussüberschriften," p. 14.

The suggestion, however, that the Salutatio might originally have been designed as an introit seems not to be without a few problems. First, while it is plausible that the 'refined literary style' would suggest an originally liturgical-formulary character of the Salutatio, that possibility would hardly necessitate the conclusion that the Salutatio was originally an introit. One might draw an analogy to the fixed place of the Salutatio, i.e., its position at the opening part of an epistle. This fixed place, however, may be explained, in part, by the common structure of a prescript as elucidated by Roller.

---

[1] Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 23. Cf. pp. 20-25.

[2] Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 55-56 and 94.

[3] Alfred Niebergall, "Die Geschichte der urchristliche Predigt" in Leiturgia, Vol. I, esp. pp. 197-198 and 200-202. Cf. Gerhard Kunze, "Die Lesungen" in Leiturgia, Vol. I, pp. 87-180; esp. pp. 103-126.

[4] Cf. E. Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon (KEK, 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 169-170.

Secondly, in order for the 'fixed place' of the Salutatio to have a definite bearing upon our knowing its alleged original place in worship, one would seem to have to assume that the epistles faithfully transcribe the actual order as well as the components of that worship. This appears to be the very assumption which underlies the works by Preisker[1] and Cross.[2] Thornton's criticism[3] as a whole is addressed to Cross's work, which we have surveyed elsewhere, but his (Thornton's) critical remark about the integrity of I Peter as an epistle[4] seems pertinent to Preisker's work as well as to Cross's, and also to the assumption that the 'fixed place' of the Salutatio would automatically suggest its original use as an introit.

---

[1] H. Windisch-H. Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, pp. 156-162.

[2] F. L. Cross, I Peter: A Paschal Liturgy (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1954).

[3] T. C. G. Thornton, "I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?" JTS, N.S. 12 (1961), 14-26.

[4] Ibid., pp. 25-26.

One possible way to interpret the liturgical-formulary character of the _Salutatio_ (while one notes the difficult problems raised by regarding the _Salutatio_ as originally designed as an introit), would be that the _Salutatio_ might represent a formula with which the preacher customarily started his sermon in the early Church. If so, as it seems possible, while the writer was deliberately following the structure of an epistolary prescript, he could have used a customary, well-known formula, which could be used (as one of its possible occasions or purposes) to introduce a sermon, as a _Salutatio_ to suit the epistle to a setting of public worship in which the epistle was supposed to be read. This is only a tentative suggestion, but it seems to accord better with the stylistic features and the 'fixed place' of the _Salutatio_ than the one advocated by Cullmann, Delling and Niebergall.

As to the second question, our conclusion will be summed up as follows: first, the original form on which the formulation of the _Salutatio_ depended, would not necessarily be a 'liturgical' one. Secondly, it would seem possible that a formula close to the _Salutatio_ might have been used in the early Church as a formula with which a preacher began his sermon.

C. In I Ptr. 5:14 we find another salutation formula variant from that in 1:2. It reads as follows:

Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

(Peace to all of you that are in Christ. RSV)

Our form-critical and history-of-liturgy observations about a salutation formula in 1:2 seem, for the most part, applicable also to a similar formula as we find it in 5:14. In this sub-section we shall limit ourselves to examining briefly the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ used in this formula.

Besides the instance in 5:14, ἐν Χριστῷ is used twice in I Peter (3:16; 5:10). Scholars such as Jülicher[1] and, most recently, Schelkle[2] take the Petrine use of this phrase as one of assured indications of the Petrine dependence upon the Pauline theology.[3] The position represented by these scholars may certainly appeal to the fact that the use of this phrase is not attested prior to the Corpus Paulinum, and that this phrase is prevalent in this Corpus.[4]

Is the view an absolutely sure proposition? The following twofold consideration seems to lessen the plausibility of this view: from a history-of-concept view, there are a few parallel expressions in the O.T.; i.e., 'in God' (בֵּאלֹהִים, ἐν τῷ θεῷ, Ps. 56:5); 'in the Lord' (בַּיהוָה, ἀπὸ κυρίου, ἐν τῷ θεῷ, Isa. 45:25). From a history-of-tradition point of view, notable parallels may be found in Jn. 6:56; 15:4ff. The Christians' being in Christ as we find in these Johannine passages, which seem so close to the Pauline expression, appears to suggest its association with the participation in the Eucharist.[1] The differences between the Johannine parallels and the Pauline ones do not seem to warrant the dependence of the Johannine ones upon the Pauline.[2]

---

[1] *Einleitung in das N.T.* (7th ed., 1931), p. 194.

[2] *Die Petrusbriefe; der Judasbrief*, p. 101.

[3] See also Oepke in *TWNT*, II, esp. 537-539; and E. Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im I. Petrusbrief," *ZNW*, XLV (1954), 83.

[4] Cf. A. Wikenhauser, *Die Christusmystik des Apostels Paulus* (2nd ed.; Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1956), p. 33. See pp. 6-14 and 26-37. Also G. A. Deissmann, *Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892), pp. 1-3.

In view of these parallels, it seems that we are to refrain from ascribing to Paul's use of ἐν Χριστῷ an _absolute_ literary and history-of-tradition priority.[3] This remark of ours appears to find a piece of supplementary evidence in the fact that I Ptr. 5:14 finds its close parallel in III Jn. 15 (εἰρήνη σοι); εἰρήνη is not by itself used in any one of the Pauline _Eschatokoll_ as part of a salutation formula.

---

[1] See C. K. Barrett, _The Gospel according to St. John_ (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), p. 247.

[2] See C. H. Dodd, _The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel_ (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), p. 196, fn. 1. Cf. pp. 195-196.

[3] See further Chase, "Peter, First Epistle of," _HDB_, III, 789. F. Neugebauer, "Das paulinische '_In Christus_'" _NTS_, IV (1957-58), 124-138; and his _In Christus_ (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).

CHAPTER III

A EULOGICAL FORMULA IN 1:3-4

Two verses, 1:3-4, seem to reflect a traditional Christian eulogical formula. The passage which concerns us at present reads as follows:

Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς
εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησου Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν,
εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον,
τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
Who, according to His great mercy, has begotten us anew
To a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,
To an imperishable, undefiled and unfading inheritance,
Which has been kept in the heavens for you.

SECTION 1

Preliminary Observation

In this section we shall be concerned primarily with the eulogical-formulary character of 1:3-4. A few problems to be taken up may be listed as follows:

1. What is a 'eulogical formula'?

2. What we have in the Petrine passage is an epistolary eulogical formula. Is there any parallel to this type of eulogical formula, and if so, how is the literary similarity, shared by the Petrine formula and the parallel, to be understood?

3. The eulogical formula which we find in the Petrine passage is of a cultic character. Can we trace the formula back to a liturgical eulogical formula?

4. What are the extent and nature of the Christianization of the Petrine eulogical formula?

A. Now we take up the first question. By 'eulogical formula' we mean, from the viewpoint of contents, a formula of exclamatory ascription of prasie to God. The ascription is often made with reference to His marvellous deeds in favour of the one, corporate or individual, who ascribes the praise. In this sense, a eulogical formula seems not substantially different from such formulary expressions as doxology[1] or aretalogy.[2] The differences appear to be strictly formal: that is, in accord with Delling, we shall call a formulary expression which begins with εὐλογητός (or its Hebrew equivalent בָּרוּךְ), an 'eulogical formula.'[3]

In the O.T. and the related literature there are a large number of parallels to the eulogical formula in our sense. In the O.T., בָּרוּךְ (εὐλογητός in the LXX) often denotes an exclamatory expression of praise to God.[1] Parallel instances are found also in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings,[2] and in the DSS.[3] As regards Rabbinic parallels, the use of the eulogical expression in the *Shema*[4] and in the *Shemone-esre*[5] is to be noted. A pronouncement of the eulogical

---

[1] Doxology is a formula which ascribes glory (*doxa*) to God, and often takes the form of "To Him be glory . . ." (G. Delling, *Der Gottesdienst im N.T.*, p. 65).

In the N.T., examples of doxology may be found, e.g., in Lk. 2:19 (cf. Lk. 19:38); Rom. 11:36 (αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν); 16:27; Gal. 1:5; Eph. 3:21; Phil. 4:21; I Tim. 1:17; II Tim. 4:18; Heb. 13:21; I Ptr. 4:11; II Ptr. 3:18; Jude 25. Cf. the readings of Matt. 6:13 (see W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* [Cambridge: The University Press, 1964], pp. 451-453). Cf. Paul Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgiving* (*Beiheft zur ZNW.* 20; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1939), p. 99.

[2] Aretalogy is a formula of praise of God's (or Christ's) 'wonderful deeds' (ἀρετή). See I Ptr. 2:9! Delling refers to the following as illustrative passages: Mk. 1:45; 7:46; Acts 14:8ff.; 16:16ff.; Rom. 15:19; II Cor. 12:12 (*Der Gottesdienst im N.T.*, p. 95, fn. 47). These passages do not represent well formulated aretalogies; rather they denote primarily aretalogical acts.

[3] Delling, *op. cit.*, p. 69. In some cases, this formal distinction may not be pressed too far, since εὐλογία , the substantival form of εὐλογητός , is used, along with *doxa* and other terms (σοφία , τιμή , ἰσχύς , κράτος), in passages which appear to be hymnodic fragments (e.g., Rev. 5:12, 13; 7:12). Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (*HNT*, 2nd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), p. 57.

---

[1] בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה e.g., Gen. 24:27; Ex. 18:10; Ruth 4:14; I Sam. 25:32 (בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל . Also Ps. 106:48), 39; II Sam. 18:28; I Kg. 1:48; 5:21; 8:15, 56; 10:9; I Chron. 16:36; 29:10; II Chron. 2:11; 6:4; 9:8; Ezra 2:27; Ps. 28:6; 31:22; 41:14; 72:18; 89:53; 119:12; 124:6; 135:21; Zech. 11:5.
בָּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים Ps. 66:20; 68:36.
בָּרוּךְ אֲדֹנָי Ps. 68:20.

בָּרוּךְ = εὐλογητός is used also with a subject other than God. Instances are found, e.g., in Gen. 14:19; 27:29, 33; Num. 22:12; 24:9; Deut. 7:14; 28:3, 4, 5, 6; 33:20; Jud. 17:2; I Sam. 15:13; 26:25; I Kg. 2:45; Isa. 19:25; Jer. 17:7; Prov. 5:18, etc.

[2] I Macc. 4:30; II Macc. 1:17; 15:34; Enoch 22:14; 39:13.

[3] E.g., IQS 11:15; IQM 13:1; 14:4; 18:6; IQH 5:20; 10:14; 11:27, 29, 32; 16:8. Cf. IQM 14: (3-)4; 18:6.

[4] Cf. Str.-Bill., Vol. IV, pp. 192-193. "Gepreisen sei der Name seines herrlichen Reiches (= Herrschaft) immer und ewiglich!"

[5] The texts of the two recensions, Palestinian and Babylonian, are given in Str.-Bill., Vol. IV, pp. 211-214. There seem to be a number of conceptual or terminological similarities between the *Shemone-esre* and I Peter. The following points may be noted:

1. God's great mercy is acknowledged in His reviving the dead: see I Ptr. 1:3 and Benediction II: "Du bist . . . . der ewig Lebende, der die Toten aufstehen lasst." (Pal.) "Du bist ein Held in Ewigkeit Jahve (der die Toten lebendig macht)." (Bab.) Cf. Benedictions I, VIII, XVII, XVIII, and XIX.
2. On I Ptr. 1:2 (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς)and 2:11 (ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους): Cf. Benediction X ("Gepreisen seist Du Jahve, der die Vertriebenen seines Volkes Israel sammelt."). Cf. Didache 9:4.
3. On I Ptr. 1:2 (χάρις . . . . καὶ εἰρήνη): Cf. Benediction XIX: "Lege Frieden (,Glück) und Segen (, Gnade und Liebe und Erbarmen auf uns. . . . " (Bab.)
4. On I Ptr. 1:5 (σωτηρία . Also in 1:9, 10;

expression follows the Torah-lection, and precedes the Prophets-lection. The expression is also part of the

---

2:2): cf. Benediction I: "Gepreisen seist du, Jahve unser Gott und Gott unser Väter, . . . Heiland (מוֹשִׁיעַ). . . ." (Bab.)

5. On I Ptr. 2:3 (εἰ ἐγεύσατε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος . Cf. Ps. 34:8. Also Heb. 6:4-6): Cf. Benediction XVIII: ". . . denn gutig ist Gott, der Allgütige." (Bab.)

6. On the metaphor of a 'spiritual house' in I Ptr. 2:5: cf. Benediction XIV: "Nimm deine Wohnung immiten Jerusalems, deiner Stadt, in naher Zeit . . . , und baue es als einen ewigen Bau eilendes in unsren Tagen." (Bab.) Cf. also Benediction XVII on the *Shekina*.

7. On the imagery of the priestly offering in I Ptr. 2:5: cf. Benediction XVII: "Habe Wohlgefallen, Jahve unser Gott, an deinem Volk Israel . . . und führe den Opferdienst zurück in das Allerheiligste deines Hauses, . . ." (Bab.)

8. On I Ptr. 2:9 (ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε . . .): cf. Benediction XVIII: "(Wir danken dir und erzählen dein Lob." (Bab.)

9. On ἐν φόβῳ in I Ptr. 2:18; 3:2, 16 (cf. 1:17; 3:14): cf. Benediction XVI: "Gepreisen seist Du, Jahve, dass wir dir dienen werden in Furcht." (Pal.) Cf. Benediction I: "(. . . furchtbarer Gott)."

10. On εὔσπλαγχνοι in I Ptr. 3:8: cf. e.g., Benediction XIX: "Barmherzigkeit" (Bab.)

11. On I Ptr. 4:7 (καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς): cf. Benediction XVI: ". . . und nimm in Erbarmen . . . unser Gebet an." (Bab.)

12. On I Ptr. 4:11 (ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός): cf. Benediction XIX: "deine Volk Israel zu sagen mit viel Kraft und Frieden." (Bab.)

13. On I Ptr. 4:18 (εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σῴζεται): cf. Benediction XIII: "Ueber die Gerechten . . . möge sich seine Erbarmen regen, . . ." (Bab.)

14. On I Ptr. 4:19 (πιστῷ κτίστῃ): cf. Benediction I: "Schöpfer." *Ktistē* in the Petrine passage is a *hapax-legomenon* in the N.T.

15. On the concept of prize-reward in I Ptr. 5:4: cf. Benediction XIII: ". . . Jahve unser Gott, und guten Lohn allen, die auf deinen Namen vertrauen." (Bab.)

Admittedly, these parallels are in most cases only fragmentary or casual, and their context hardly corresponds to the Petrine setting. Despite these differences, would it be possible to take these parallels as indicative of the conceptual milieu, from which the conceptual formulation of I Peter might have been prayer before meals.[1] These numerous instances in various strata of writings seem to suggest that the eulogical expression had an assured place in O.T.-Later Judaistic piety, and that it had this place, as some of the instances would appear to suggest, as a liturgical formula.

In the N.T. εὐλογητός is used in Mk. 14:61; Rom. 1:25; 9:5; II Cor. 1:3; 11:31; Eph. 1:3 as well as in I Ptr. 1:3.[2] In Mk. 14:61 God is designated as 'the blessed One' (ὁ εὐλογητός):[3] therefore, this case may not properly be classified as an eulogical formula, though it would be possible that this particular

---

drawn?

On the Shemone-esre and its bearing upon the formulation of Christian liturgical expressions, cf. K. G. Kuhn, Achzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1950). Kuhn's main thesis is that the Jewish liturgical formulae such as Shema and Shemone-esre are constructed, like some prose lines in the O.T., upon a certain rhyme scheme, or 'Endreim,' and that the rhyme was "taken over from the Jewish synagogues into the early Christian church," (op. cit., p. 27; cf. p. 29). Kuhn attempts to substantiate his view by examining the reconstructed Aramaic texts of the Matthean and the Lucan forms of the Lord's Prayer. Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925), pp. 127-237. Oesterley is concerned there with detecting reminiscences of the Shemone-esre among the Apostolic Fathers and Early Church Fathers (including the Liturgy of Sarapion).

[1] Cf. Beyer in TWNT, II, 758-759. The eulogical expression is also used at the ceremony of circumcision (Str.-Bill., Vol. IV, pp. 28-31).

[2] In addition to these parallels, a doxological use of εὐλογία in, e.g., Rev. 5:12, 13; 7:12 may also be noted.

[3] Taylor regards this exceptional instance in Mk. 14:61 as a case representing the "Jewish tendency to avoid

appellation of God might have originated in the customary (liturgical) use of the expression "Blessed be the God. . . ."[1] The remaining instances of εὐλογητός may be called eulogical expression/formulae, and may be classified, with reference to the given context, as follows:

1. hymnodic use of the eulogical expression:

   Lk. 1:68 (Cf. vss. 68-79).

2. opening words of a proemium:[2]

   II Cor. 1:3 (Cf. vss. 3-7);
   Eph. 1:3 (Cf. vss. 3-14);
   I Ptr. 1:3 (Cf. vss. 3-4).

3. an outbursting of praise in an epistolary context:

   Rom. 1:25; 9:5.

4. part of an oath-like statement:

   II Cor. 11:31

Let us turn to the formulary character of the eulogical expression in 1:3-4.

---

direct reference to God." (Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark London: Macmillan & Co., 1959 , p. 567.) Cf. Str.-Bill., Vol. II, esp. pp. 308-311.

[1] Cf. Str.-Bill., loc. cit., esp. p. 310. Also Vol. II, p. 51; and Vol. IV, p. 629.

[2] Proemium designates an opening portion of the main body of an epistolary writing. Cf. N. A. Dahl, "Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes," TZ, VII (1951), 241-264; esp. 250ff. Also Schubert, Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgiving, passim.

First, let us see whether it is justified to take up vss. 3-4 as a unit of an eulogical formula. Our definition of 'eulogical formula' given above is our starting-point. As a number of instances would show (e.g., II Sam. 18:28; I Kg. 5:21; 8:15, 56; II Chron. 2:11; 6:4; Ps. 124:6; I Macc. 4:30; II Macc. 1:17; 15; 34; IQM 5:20; 10:14-15; 11:27-28; 11:32-33), when eulogical expressions are made with specific references to God's deeds, these expressions, as a rule, take God as an active subject.[1] When we turn to I Ptr. 1:5, the participial clause in the verse (τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ κτλ .) modifies ὑμᾶς in vs. 4; thus the clause appears to be secondary. Vs. 6 is a reference to the addressees' situation in suffering;[2] vs. 7 takes up vs. 6; these two verses also seem to be secondary. The secondary character of vss. 5ff. would explain a certain disparity in the flow of thought between these verses and the preceding vss. 3-4. Therefore, vss. 5f. do not appear to constitute an integral part of the eulogical formula, composed of vss. 3-4.

---

[1] Simple eulogical expressions without any reference to God's deeds may be found, e.g., in I Chron. 16:36; 29:10; Ps. 89:53; 106:48; 135:21; Enoch 39:13. Cf. Rom. 1:25; 9:5.

[2] A phrase ἐν ᾧ in vs. 6 is one of the difficult exegetical problems in I Peter (cf. 2:12; 3:16, 19; 4:4). Limiting ourselves to the case in vs. 6, it seems that ἐν ᾧ here is to be taken as an adverbial phrase referring to the preceding vss. 3-4 and vs. 5. We take this view in agreement with Knopf (*Die Briefe Petri und Judä*, p. 47), Wohlenberg (g. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief* *KNT*, 2nd ed.; Leipzig: A Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1915 , pp. 13-14), Beare(*The First Epistle of Peter*, p. 60), and Selwyn (*The First Epistle of St. Peter*, pp. 125-126). Ὧ is understood to be neuter. If one takes ᾧ as masculine, it is grammatically plausible to regard καιρῷ as the antecedent of ᾧ ; this view, however, seems to present difficulty in interpretation.

Schelkle's attempt to regard ἐν ᾧ as referring to ὁ ἀναγεννήσας seems hardly justifiable syntactically; the other two relative constructions (ὃν ἀγαπᾶτε , vs. 8; εἰς ὃν πιστεύοντες , vs. 8)

The original form of ὑμᾶς (vs. 4) might have been ἡμᾶς , representing a proper person in an eulogical expression. The use of ὑμᾶς may be due to our Petrine writer's concern for the present epistolary context.

In addition to the notable use of εὐλογητός , the following literary features would also seem to suggest the formulary character of 1:3-4.

1. The use of a participial construction (i.e., ἀναγεννήσας) with ὁ θεός as subject.

2. The instance of ὁμοιοκάταρκτον (Note the repeated use of eis).

3. The instance of ὁμοιοτέλευτον (Note the use of ἡμᾶς , and ὑμᾶς / ἡμᾶς , vs. 4).

4. The synonymous parallelism between two phrases introduced by εἰς.[1]

---

refer to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (vs. 7), and not to God, as Schelkle seems to assume (Die Petrusbriefe . . ., p. 27).

[1] Beare says, "God has regenerated us εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν, εἰς κληρονομίαν . . . , εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . 'unto a living hope, unto an inheritance, unto a salvation.'" (The First Epistle of Peter, p. 56). This alleged "progressive widening of thought," as formulated into a triadic scheme, seems unlikely from a syntactical point of view, since εἰς σωτηρίαν modifies (τοὺς) φρουρουμένους , and not (ὁ) ἀναγεννήσας .

In this sub-section we have tried to make clear what an eulogical formula is, and that I Ptr. 1:3-4 is comprised of such a formula, accompanied by some notable formulary features.

B. Now comes the second question, i.e., whether there is any parallel to the eulogical proemium which we find in 1:3-4.

Among the O.T. parallels of eulogical expressions, there is a case of an eulogical proemium in II Chron. 2:11; there the expression is used in a letter sent by Huram, the king of Tyre, to Solomon. The passage reads:

> Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who made heaven and earth, who has given King David a wise son, endued with discretion and understanding, who will build a temple for the Lord, and a royal palace for himself. . . .

Dahl, who has done a special study of the eulogical proemium in Ephesians, notes that this letter by Huram is presented differently in I Kg. 5:21; i.e., as Huram's spontaneous, oral expression of praise at his hearing the good news from Solomon (cf. II Sam. 18:28); and, in view of this instance, Dahl suggests that one would be able to trace the eulogical proemium back to a spontaneous outburst into praise, made by one who heard good tidings.[1] Dahl further suggests that the alteration or adaptation of the text of Huram's statement as found elsewhere (i.e., II Chron. 2:11; Praeparationis Evangelicae IX:34; Josephus, Antiquities, VIII:2) would be best understood if it is assumed that the use of an eulogical expression as an eulogical proemium might have been well known and customary.[1] The first of these suggestions by Dahl may be questioned, since the possibility of liturgical use of the eulogical expression would have to be taken into consideration. The second suggestion, however, does seem pertinent. This line of consideration, as well as the parallels adduced, would appear to have an important bearing upon the question whether, as to the use of eulogical expression as an eulogical proemium, the Petrine passage is directly dependent on the Pauline ones: what can be said as to this usage is that Petrine dependence would be possible, but not necessarily probable.

---

[1] Dahl, "Adresse und Proömium im Epheserbrief," p. 251. Cf. pp. 250-264.

C. The third question is about the original form of the eulogical proemium. Was the orignal form a liturgical eulogical formula?

The eulogical expression derives its cultic character from the very fact that it takes God as the object of the ascription of praise; one of the proper loci for the use of the expression, or a Sitz which calls forth the expression, is, without doubt,[a] setting of worship, corporate or private. Since there was, in Israel, no individual piety, or expression of it, apart from the corporate life in faith of the Volksgemeinde, personal use of the eulogical expression sometimes with casual or spontaneous overtones may be regarded as having been grounded upon, and as corresponding to, corporate use of the expression in public worship.[1] That the eulogical expression attained nearly the status of a liturgical formula in the O.T.-Jewish milieu, seems suggested by its almost verbally fixed wording and by its appearing in association with various liturgical contexts and formulae (e.g., I Kg. 8:15, 56; I Chron. 16:36; 29:10; II Chron. 6:4; Ps 41:14; 72:18-19; 89:53; 106:48; 124:6; 135:21; IQH 16:8; IQM 14:4; 18:6-7).

---

[1] Dahl's reference to II Macc. 2:10ff. seems worth noting ("Adresse und Proömium im Epheserbrief," p. 251). A letter, written by Jews and addressed to Aristobulus, begins with a wish of 'greetings and health' (χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν) and with a thanksgiving to God (εὐχαριστοῦμεν). Nevertheless, so Dahl notes, an eulogical expression is also employed in 2:11 (κατὰ πάντα εὐλογητὸς ἡμῶν ὁ θεός . . .).

The eulogical expressions in the N.T. (i.e., Lk. 1:68; Rom. 1:25; 9:5; II Cor. 1:3; 11:31; Eph. 1:3 as well as I Ptr. 1:3) seem to reveal a liturgical-formulary character. Such a character in Lk. 1:68 may be taken for granted, since the eulogical expression forms an opening part of a hymn.[1] The epistolary eulogical expressions also seem to be of a liturgical-formulary character or suggestive of their derivation from a liturgical use. The examples of outbursts of praise introduced somewhat abruptly into the epistolary context (Rom. 1:25; 9:5), despite Paul's surprising manner of using them, embody neatly constructed liturgical formulae, to which the association of εὐλογητός with God is contributive, as well as the use of a formulary phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας[2] and an ἀμήν.[3] The liturgical-formulary character of the oath-like eulogical expression in I Cor. 11:31 seems to be suggested by a formal phrase ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ [1] and by the parallel features to the Romans passage mentioned above.

---

[1] Sigmund Mowinckel, Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmdichtung (no. 5 of his Psalmenstudien; Kristiania: In Komission bei Jacob Dybwad, 1924), pp. 27 ff. See an excursus, "'Das kollective Ich' in den Psalmen," pp. 36-38.

---

[1] Cf. Hermann Gunkel, "Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu bei Lukas" in Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freuden A. von. Harnack (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1921), pp. 43-60. Also Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (THNT; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), pp. 68-74.

[2] Cf. מֵהָעוֹלָם וְעַד־הָעוֹלָם, Ps. 41:14; I Chron. 16:36. מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם, Ps 115:18. , Ps. 89:53. Also the doxology attached to the Shema-recitation (Str.-Bill., Vol. I, pp. 423-424).

[3] Ἀμήν is used in the O.T. as an "acclamation by the congregation of the doxology pronounced." (Frör, "Salutationen, Benediktionen, Amen" in Leiturgia, Vol. I, p. 592). Cf. I Chron. 16:36; Neh. 8:6; Ps. 41:14; 71:19; 89:53; 106:48. In the synagogue liturgy, ἀμήν is "the most important and most often used form of response." (I. Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtliche Entwicklung, 3rd ed., 1931, p. 495. Quoted by Frör, loc. cit.). Cf. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, pp. 147-148. Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 73-75.

On the exegetical problems related to Rom. 9:5, cf. O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 197-199. Also Cullmann, Die Christologie des N.Ts., pp. 320-321.

We have surveyed elsewhere[2] the features which seem to suggest the formulary charaater of I Ptr. 1:3-4. The same character appears to be suggested for II Cor. 1:3ff. and Eph. 1:3ff., in addition to the conspicuous use of εὐλογητός (κτλ.), by the following literary features:[3]

1. The use of a participial construction (ὁ παρακαλῶν , II Cor. 1:3; ὁ εὐλογήσας and προορίσας , Eph. 1:3, 5), of which God is the subject.

2. Somewhat elaborate theo-logical references in II Cor.; repeated Christological references (ἐν Χριστῷ , ἐν αὐτῷ et al.).

3. The instance of homoiokatarkton in I Cor. 1:3-4 (note the use of ὁ πατήρ and ὁ παρακαλῶν).

4. Instances of homoioteleuton (ἡμῶν and ἡμῶν in II Cor. 1:3, 5; Χριστοῦ , κόσμου , αὐτοῦ , αὐτοῦ in Eph. 1:3-5; ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ in Eph. 1:3, 6).

5. A certain parallelism in II Cor. 1:5 (note the use of καθώς and οὕτως).

An original liturgical use of these formulary expressions would possibly be inferred, first, in view of a number of instances of liturgical eulogical expressions in O.T.-Jewish literature, and secondly, because of the setting of public worship in which these epistles would seem to have been designed to be read; to the second of these two, we have already referred in relation to our discussion on 1:2.

---

[1] Cf. Lohmeyer, "Briefliche Grussüberschriften," esp. pp. 17ff.

[2] See page 147.

[3] On Eph. 1:3ff., cf. John Coutts, "Ephesians 1:3-14 and 1. Peter 1:3-12," NTS, III (1957), 115-117.

With regard to the third question, one would be able to say that the eulogical proemium which we find in I Ptr. 1:3-4 as well as in II Cor. 1:3ff. and Eph. 1:3ff. may be traced back to, or be regarded as reflecting, a liturgical eulogical formula.

D. Now we come to the fourth question: the extent of Christianization of the eulogical formulae as found in I Ptr. 1: (3-) 4; II Cor. 1:3 and Eph. 1:3. This question may be appraoched by means of comparison of the formulae with the ones found in O.T.-Jewish literature and also through elucidation of these N.T. formulae.

One of the briefest eulogical expressions in O.T.-Jewish writings may be found in Ps. 68 (67):36, which reads בָּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים (εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός). In most of the instances, the brief form exemplified in this Psalm passage is modified by a genitival phrase (e.g., τοῦ κυριοῦ μοῦ Ἀβραάμ, Gen. 24:27), an appositional phrase (e.g., Enoch 22:14; Jubilee 22:27; IQH 10:14; an appositional phrase followed by a participial clause, I Macc. 4:30), or a relative clause (e.g., Gen. 24:27;

I Sam. 25:32, 39; Ps. 66:20; IQH 11:27; IQM 14:4-5. The LXX has ὅτι for אֲשֶׁר in Ex. 18:10. An adverbial phrase κατὰ πάντα and a personal pronoun ἡμῶν accompany it in II Macc. 1:17). The form may be modified by a participial clause (e.g., I Macc. 15:34). One of the typically O.T. eulogical expressions may be found in I Sam. 25:32 (. . . בָּרוּךְ יהוה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר, εὐλογητὸς ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ), which is reproduced *verbatim* in Lk. 1:68.

Among the N.T. eulogical expressions, the examples in Rom. 1:25[1] and 9:5[2] seem to reflect no distinct trace of Christianization. From a formal point of view, it would be possible that Paul might simply have been drawing upon a traditional O.T.-Later Judaistic expression.[3] Despite the absence of explicitly Christian motifs from these passages, however, it would also be possible that Paul might be reproducing an eulogical formula which was already current in the early Church, for it would be difficult to suppose that Paul used, in epistles intended for Christian readers, any traditional O.T.-Jewish expression which was not also known and accepted among Christians. The 'liturgical-formulary' character we have adduced elsewhere concerning Rom. 1:25; 9:5 would seem to speak for the latter suggestion.

---

[1] . . . τὸν κρίσαντα, ὃς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν . (. . . the One who created, who is to be blessed forever. Amen).

[2] Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν. (The God, who is over all, is to be blessed forever, Amen).

[3] Cf. William Sanday-A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (*ICC*, 12th ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 46. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, p. 59. Also Otto Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1957), p. 50.

Conspicuous cases of Christianized eulogical expressions are found in II Cor. 1:3 and Eph. 1:3 as well as in I Ptr. 1:3:

I Ptr. 1:3	II Cor. 1:3	Eph. 1:3
εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς	εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς	εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς
καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου	καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου	καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ	ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ	ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ, (ὁ ...)	Χριστοῦ, (ὁ ...)	Χριστοῦ, (ὁ ...)

It would be possible to identify the Christianizing part with the phrase καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ., since, first, there are exact parallels, though not numerous, to εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός (בָּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים) in the O.T. (Ps. 65:20; 67:36. LXX. Cf. II Macc. 1:17 and IQM 14:4-5); secondly, there seems to be no problem, from a grammatical point of view, in our taking θεός absolutely; and thirdly, God as the Father of Jesus Christ is a very common designation of God in the N.T.[1]

---

[1] Cf. e.g., Matt. 7:21; 10:32, 33; 11:25, 26, 27; 12:50; 15:13; 16:17, 27; 18:19, 35; 20:23; 25:34; 26:29, 39, 42, 53; Lk. 2:49; 9:26; 10:21, 22; 22:29; 23:34, 46; Jn. 2:16; 5:17, 18, 43; 6:32, 40; 8:19, 49, 54; 10:18, 25, 29, 37; 11:41; 12:27, 28; 14:2, 20, 21, 23; 15:1, 8, 10, 15, 23, 24; 17:1, 5, 21, 24, 25; 20:17; Heb. 1:5; Rev. 1:6; 2:28; 3:5, 21; 14:1. Cf. H. W. Montefiore,

Against this identification Hort comes out with a suggestion that the genitival τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be taken with both ὁ θεός and πατήρ.[1] Hort bases his proposal on the following grounds:

1. This construction "along agrees naturally with the collocation of words."

2. Since there is no feature to suggest that readers make a pause, the phrase ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ would have to be read as one continuous phrase.[2] In this regard Hort appeals to a similar construction ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν in Gal. 1:4; Phil. 4:20; I Thess. L:3; 3:11, 13 (cf. Rev. 1:6).

3. In I Ptr. 1:3, as elsewhere, θεός is as much an appellative as πατήρ."[3]

"God as Father in the Synoptic Gospels," NTS, III (1956-57), 31-46).

[1] F. J. A. Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan & Co., 1898), p. 29. The same view is also held, e.g., by Bigg (Charles Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude [ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901], pp. 96-97) and Schelkle (Die Petrusbriefe, p. 27, fn. 3).

[2] Compare this remark made by Hort with that of Knopf (Die Briefe Petri und Judä, p. 40). Knopf thinks that a view based on the absence of a definite article from πατήρ is not cogent, and refers to Winer-Schmiedel §18:7. The ὁ of ὁ θεός would possibly be explained (against Knopf) as an instance of a 'comprehensive' definite article which refers here both to θεός and πατήρ. (Cf. Moule, An Idiom Book of N.T. Greek, p. 110).

[3] Hort maintains that the combination of θεός and πατήρ by N.T. writers has "doubtless a clear purpose." (Op. cit., p. 21.)

4. The identical construction in Eph. 1:3 is defined by appositional phrases in Eph. 1:17 ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης ; the definition may also be applicable to the phrase in the Petrine passage. The motif, that God is the God of Jesus Christ, is paralleled elsewhere in the N.T.[1]

The weight of evidence thus adduced by Hort seems to tip the scales in favour of his suggestion. If this line of understanding of τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησου Χριστοῦ should be a probable one, as it seems, we could not delimit the extent of Christianization, from a formal point of view, only to καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κτλ . Rather, the content of affirmation about God is substantially Christianized by its being defined by a genitival phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ : God is, in Christian affirmation, primarily 'Christ's God and Father';[2] from this the

---

[1] Cf. Jn. 20:17; Rev. 1:6; 3:2, 12. Also Mk. 15:34 (=Matt. 27:46. Ps. 22:2); Heb. 1:9 (Ps. 44:8, LXX). Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 29. Also Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, p. 96.

On Eph. 1:17, see, e.g., C. Masson, *L'épitre de Saint Paul aux Ephésiens* (*CNT*; Paris: Delachaux & Nestlé, 1953), p. 153. On Mk. 15:34, see, e.g., Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. 593-594. On Heb. 1:9, see, e.g., O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (*KEK*, 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 55-57. On Rev. 1:6, see, e.g., R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), Vol. I, p. 17.

[2] Cf. Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (*KEK*, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), pp. 8-11.

Christians' relationship to God ensues (cf. Gal. 1:4).[1]

The outcome of our study in Section 1 may be outlined as follows:

1. By an 'eulogical formula' we mean, from the viewpoint of contents, a formula of exclamatory prescription of praise to God. The eulogical formula is distinguished formally from doxology and aretalogy by its use of εὐλογητός (בָּרוּךְ).

What we have in I Ptr. 1:3-4 is an eulogical formula. Its formulary character seems suggested, besides the use of εὐλογητός , by several formulary features.

2. The eulogical formula in I Ptr. 1:3-4 (and II Cor. 1:3ff.; Eph. 1:3ff.) is an eulogical proemium. A notable parallel to this type of expression may be found in II Chron. 2:11.

3. The eulogical proemium as we have it in the Petrine passage sees to reflect a liturgical eulogical formula, and its original Sitz would possibly be sought in the setting of communal worship of the early Church.

4. The extent of Christianization of the traditional O.T.-Jewish eulogical expressions would seem more substantial than a simply formal comparison might allow:

---

[1] Cf. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, esp. p. 10.

in Christian affirmation God is now 'Christ's God and Father.'

SECTION 2

A History-of-Tradition Examination

In this section we shall limit ourselves to studying the concept of rebirth (ἀναγεννήσας in vs. 3) propounded in the passage concerned.

Ἀναγεννάω appears twice in I Peter (1:3, 23), and nowhere else in the N.T. In the LXX, it appears only once, i.e., in the Prologue of Sirach, as a variant reading (ἀναγεννηθείς , S*) to παραγενηθείς (A B). There are few instances of the verb in the contemporary literature (ca. A.D. 1st century).[1] The rare use of ἀναγεννάω in related literature forms one of the difficult problems with regard to the word. At the same time, there are possible or probable cognate/synonymous instances outside, as well as within, the N.T. Our study will be conducted under the following two main headings:

First, we shall enumerate and outline cognate/synonymous instances as found outside the N.T. That is, this is an attempt to elucidate history-of-concept parallels.

---

[1] Cf. Büchsel in TWNT, I, 671-672. Also Liddell-Scott, p. 100.

Secondly, we shall try to clarify the history-of-tradition relationships of ἀναγεννάω by means of a comparative analysis of possible N.T. parallels.

Before we take the two steps of study just mentioned, we shall sketch the idea of rebirth in I Ptr. 1:3, 23.

Ἀναγεννάω in 1:3 is a metaphorical expression of the faith that Christians have been brought into a new life situation by God; and this situation, divinely initiated, is viewed under an 'eschatological'[1] perspective ("to a living hope"--"to an imperishable . . . inheritance"). God is the active subject of ἀναγεννήσας; for this reason God is to be blessed. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is regarded here as being instrumental (δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν)[2] in bringing about the rebirth, which is wrought by God's plenteous mercy. In 1:23, the 'living and abiding word of God,' or the 'incorruptible seed,' is said to be a means of rebirth (note διά , synonymous with ἐκ . . . ἀφθάρτου . . . λόγου); here the participle ἀναγεννημένοι is used in a causal sense[3] to denote an indicative basis of an imperative immediately preceding ("Love one another earnestly from the heart"). The presence of a communal consciousness in 1:3 (inferred in the used of ἡμῶν , ἡμᾶς) is to be noted.[1] The old manner of existence seems to be understood as something out of which Christians' souls are to be purified (1:22; cf. 1:23) or as something to be put away (2:1; cf. 1:14).[2] An emphasis implied by the use of the metaphorical expression is placed on the newness of life which ensues from conversion.

---

[1] 'Eschatological'--in the sense that realization of these *Heilsgüte* is expected in the future.

[2] Cf. G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und Judasbrief*, p. 15.

[3] Cf. Blass-Debrunner, § 418 (p. 260). Also Moule, *An Idiom Book of N.T. Greek*, pp. 102-103.

One of the interpretative problems related to the Petrine passages (1:3, 23) in whether 'rebirth' may be an allusion to baptism. This problem will be taken up later along with Tit. 3:5, a closely similar passage to I Ptr. 1:3-4.

---

[1] Cf. Theophil Spörri, *Der Gemeindegedanke im ersten Petrusbrief* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925), pp. 204-206.

[2] Gunkel quotes Dietrich with approval: "The concepts of the dying of the old man and the birth of the new man had a prominent place in the religious thought and rites of many peoples." Gunkel thinks that these concepts were prevelant in N.T. times, although they are not found in the O.T., and are foreign to Pharisaism (H. Gunkel, *Der erste Brief des Petrus*, Vol. III of *Die Schriften des N.Ts.* [3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917], p. 255). Gunkel seems to suggest that the idea of rebirth in I Ptr. 1:3 is to be interpreted in accordance with these concepts (cf. Richard Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienrelition und das Problem des I. Petrusbriefes* [Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1911], pp. 37-39). However, so far as we know from 1:3, 23 and their immediate contexts, rebirth is *not*, at least explicitly, contrasted with the motif of death, as contrasted with "new life."

A. The following instances may be noted as history-of-concept parallels to the Petrine idea of rebirth, or the divine begetting:

1. In the O.T. there are admittedly only a few parallels to the idea of begetting of which the active subject is God.[1] The following passages may be cited as parallels:

(a) Deut. 32:18, "You were unmindful of the Rock that begot you, and you forgot the God who gave you birth."[2] This passage, which forms a synonymous parallelism, in a vivid, figurative way depicts God as the initiator of Israel as a 'community of the covenant' and Israel as neglectful of Him. Vriezen notes that, in this passage, "the ancient oriental image of generation" is adopted, though the image is regarded by him as connoting a symbolical meaning (cf. Deut. 32:6).[3] It seems that, by the use of the imagery of begetting, an emphasis seems to be laid on the 'relationship in love' between Father and son as conceived within a context of the convenantal relationship, and not on God's procreative function.

---

[1] The idea of Yahweh's being the Father of Israel is expressed e.g., in Ex. 4:22; Deut. 14:1; 32:6; Isa. 1:2; 30:9; 63:16; 64:8; Jer. 3:4; Hosea 11:1; Mal. 1:6. Th. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of O.T. Theology* (Newton, Mass.: Charles T. Branford Co., 1960), p. 145.

[2] צוּר יְלָדְךָ תֶּשִׁי וַתִּשְׁכַּח אֵל מְחֹלְלֶךָ (... θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε ἐγκατέλιπες καὶ ἐπελάθου θεοῦ τοῦ τρέφοντός σε .) Cf. G. A. Smith, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1918), pp. 350-351. Also Gerhard von Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose* (*ATD*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 141.

'Rock' (צוּר) as an appellation of God is used, e.g., in Deut. 32:15; I Sam. 2:2; II Sam. 22:32, 47; 23:3, etc. Cf. Cullmann in *TWNT*, VI, 94-95. Note that the LXX renders 'Rock' by θεός .

[3] Vriezen, *loc. cit.*

(b) Ps. 2:7, ("I will tell of the decree of the Lord:) "He said to me, 'You are my son; today I have begotten you.'"[1] This is an instance of applying the explicit imagery of begetting to the relationship between Yahweh and a king enthroned in Jerusalem.[2] Despite the vivid imagery of divine begetting, the sonship of the king seems understood in terms of adoption, or a new status bestowed upon him as the "heir and representative of the divine Lordship."[3]

(c) Prov. 8:25, "Before the mountains had been shaped, before the hills, I was brought forth."[4] The passive subject of γεννάω is Wisdom. This is an instance of an anthropomorphic expression of the origin of Wisdom. This verse seems to be related to the part of synonymous parallelisms that we find in 8:22ff. (cf. Sirach 24:9).

---

[1] אָמַר אֵלַי בְּנִי אַתָּה אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ׃ (Κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς ἐμε, 'Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε .)

[2] H.- J. Kraus, Psalmen (BK, 2nd ed.; Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), p. 19.

[3] *Ibid.* In addition to Ps. 2:7, Schelkle, for instance, refers to the LXX reading of Ps. 109:3 (Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe, p. 29), which reads: ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑοσφόρου ἐξεγέννησά σε . ("From the womb before the morning-star I brought you forth.") On the text-critical problems related to this reading, see Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. 753.

[4] בְּטֶרֶם הָרִים הָטְבָּעוּ לִפְנֵי גְבָעוֹת חוֹלָלְתִּי (πρὸ τοῦ ὄρε ἑδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με).

2. In the widely ranging Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings, there is no explicit parallel, so far as we can tell, to the idea of God's begetting someone, which there are a number of instances to affirm the fatherhood of God[1] or His being the Maker/Fashioner of someone.[2]

3. Now we turn to Philo and Josephus.

Ἀναγέννησις, the substantival form of ἀναγεννάω, is used by Philo (Aet. Mund. 8. Cf. Aet. Mund. 9);[3]

---

[1] E.g., III Macc. 5:7; 17:6; Sirach 23:1; Wis. Sol. 14:3; Jubilee 1:24, 25; Test. Levi 18:6; Sibyl. Or. 5:360, 500. The language of Jubilee 1:24 (". . . I will be their Father and they shall be My children. . . .") seems closely parallel to Ex. 4:22, 23; Deut. 14:1; 32:6; Isa. 63:16; Jer. 31:9. Cf. Charles, APOT, III, 12-13, fn. 24.

[2] E.g., II Baruch 17:4; 54:9; 82:2; IV Ezra 7:94; Test. app. I:9:5; Sibyl. Or. 3:726. Cf. Pirche Aboth 4:29. Also IQH IX:35-36.

[3] We owe all the references to Philo to Büchsel in TWNT, I, 667, and to his Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928), pp. 60-61.

the text reads:

> οἱ δὲ Στωικοὶ κόσμον μὲν ἕνα, γενέσεως δ' αὐτοῦ θεὸν αἴτινον, φθορᾶς δὲ μηκέτι θεόν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐν τοῖς οὖσι πυρὸς ἀκαμάτου δύναμιν χρόνων μακραῖς περιόδοις ἀναλύουσιν τὰ πάντα εἰς ἑαυτήν, ἐξ ἧς πάλιν ἀναγέννησιν κόσμου συνίστασθαι προμηθείᾳ τοῦ τεχνίτου.
>
> (But the Stoics affirm that there is one world, and that God is the cause of its creation, but that God is not the cause of its destruction; but that the power which is contained in existing things, in the long periods of never-ending time, attracts everything to itself, from which again a regeneration of the world is caused by the prudence of the Creator.)[1]

The word ἀναγέννησις here refers to the Stoic teaching of the renewal of the world, and not to God's begetting. This word seems to be used here as an equivalent of παλιγγενεσία,[2] which Philo employs elsewhere (Aet. Mund. 89ff.) in his describing the same Stoic teaching.

Philo uses γεννάω in various ways in relation with God: God begets λόγος,[3] man,[4] beasts and plants.[1] However, Philo nowhere refers to Israel's being children of God with γεννάω or its derivatives.[2] His use of γεννάω is limited, in Howard's terms, to ideas of "God's creative activity or of His endowment of men with spiritual, ethical or religious gifts."[3] In Büchsel's view, Philo's use of γεννάω is in line with the conceptual framework of the Hellenistic Mysteries.[4]

---

[1] Greek text: Leopoldvs Cohn (ed.), Philonis Alexandrini, opera qvae svpersvnt (Berlin: Georgii Reimeri, 1906), Vol. VI, p. 75. E.t. by C. D. Yonge, The Works of Philo Judaeus (London: Henry B. Bohn, 1855), Vol. IV, p. 190.

[2] Παλιγγενεσία is a compound word, consisting of an adverb πάλιν and a noun γένεσις, and is best rendered by 're-existence' (Wiederentstehung. Büchsel in TWNT, I, 685), or 'return to life' (or to a special form of existence). The idea of rebirth seems to be not inherent to παλιγγενεσία, though the idea may be inferred from this word figuratively (cf. Buchsel in TWNT, I, 685, fn. 2). Dey refers to the description of this word in Hesychius' lexicon, τὸ ἐκ δευτέρου ἀναγεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἀνακαινισθῆναι (Joseph Dey, ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ [Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937], p. 4.

[3] Confus. Linguar. §63.

[4] Quis div. rer. heres. §200. Adam is also said to have been begotten of God (Virtut. ib. § 204f. Opif. mundi §84:744).

Josephus uses ἀναγεννάω (Bell. 4:484); the text reads:

> ἔστι γοῦν ἔτι λείψανα τοῦ θείου πυρός, καὶ πέντε μὲν πόλεων ἰδεῖν σκιάς, ἔτι δὲ κἀν τοῖς καρποῖς σποδιὰν ἀναγεννωμένην, οἳ χροιὰν μὲν ἔχουσι τῶν ἐδωδίμων ὁμοίαν, ...
>
> (In the consequence of which there are still the remainders of that divine fire; and the traces of the five cities are still to be seen, as well as the ashes growing in their fruits have a colour as if they were fit to be eaten. . . .)

The context of this passage is Josephus' account of the legendary traces of Sodom, burnt by the divine fire. The verb ἀναγεννάω refers to the transformation, or resuscitation, of the ashes of the destroyed cities into the form of fruits, and not to God's begetting.

---

[1] Mutat, nomin. §63.

[2] Büchsel, Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus, p. 60. Cf. W. F. Howard, Christianity according to St. John (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949), p. 202.

[3] Howard, loc. cit.

[4] Büchsel in TWNT, I, 667. Büchsel refers to R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistichen Mysterienreligionen, pp. 245ff.

Josephus also uses ἀναγεννάω (Ant. IV:47:319); the text reads:

> ... θεοῦ δὲ μὴ πειραθείητε χαλεπαίνοντος ὑπὲρ ἀμελουμένον νόμων, οὓς αὐτὸς γεννήσας ὑμῖν ἔδωκε.
>
> (. . . And you may never experience that displeasure of God, which will be the consequence of the neglect of these his laws, which He, who begot you, has given you.)

The context of this passage is Moses' blessing and speech to the whole multitude after commissioning Joshua to lead the army out against the Cannaanites. Since Josephus seems to follow closely the account of Moses' very last days as recounted in Deuteronomy (cf. 33:1ff. and Ant. IV:48:320, μετ' εὐλογίας ἑκάστε τῶν φυλῶν),[1] it would seem possible that Josephus' remark might reflect the language of Deut. 32:18 (LXX), which we have observed elsewhere. Γεννάω appears to refer to God's begetting of the Israelite people,[2] though the object of γεννάω is not specified.

4. Now we come to possible parallels in Rabbinic literature.[3]

---

[1] Cf. William Whiston (tr.), The Works of Falvius Josephus (London: Chatto & Winders, 1889), V6l. II, p. 192, fn.*.

[2] Against Büchsel in TWNT, I, 667. Büchsel maintains that γεννάω does not take God as its subject. His view would be tenable if αὐτός did not mean God in this context.

[3] Cf. Rengstorf in TWNT, I, 664-666. Str.-Bill., Vol. II, pp. 421-423. Erick Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palastinischen Judentum," Studia Theologica, IV (1951), 44-85. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (2nd ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1958), esp. pp. 119-121.

The imagery of 'being a new-born child' is used, in the first place, in association with proselytes. One of a few notable passages is B.T. Yebamoth 48b. There R. Jose (ca. A.D. 150) argues against R. Hananiah (who maintains that proselytes incurred afflictions because they had not observed the Noachian commandments) by saying that, since the proselyte converted to Judaism is like a newborn child, he cannot be punished for his misconduct in the days prior to his conversion.[1] This would seem to imply that the proselyte's life prior to conversion is disregarded entirely; and, with the conversion, he now starts a totally new existence.[2] In this sense also the proselyte is compared indirectly to a new creature: "He who brings a man under the wings of Shekinah, is reckoned as if the one who has created and formed and shaped him." (Cant.R. 1:3 §3).[3] The imagery of 'being a newborn babe' and 'being a new creature' seem to be used almost synonymously to denote a new status which the proselyte acquires at his conversion to Judaism.

---

[1] Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung . . .," p. 46-47; Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 119.

[2] Sjöberg, op. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 54. On the expression 'to bring someone under the wings of Shekinah': see Gen. R. 12:14, 39 (Sjöberg, op. cit., p. 45).

Paul's use of the phrase, 'new creation' (καινὴ κτίσις . II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15) may be explained in terms of dependence upon Rabbinic imagery of 'being a newborn babe'--'being a new creature.' Cf. Davies, op. cit., pp. 119-121. To this phrase we shall return later.

In the second place, the imagery of 'being a newborn babe' is applied to the Israelite people especially in association with the conclusion of the convenantal relationship with God on Sinai. Cant.r. 8:2 interprets the words of Song 8:2 as describing the situation on Sinai; i.e., 'the house of my mother' is understood to mean Sinai, since "Israelites there were compared to a newborn child." (R.Berechaja).[1] "Israelites have, on Sinai, come into an entirely new religious situation."[2]

5. Possible parallels in Mystery religions are now to be mentioned.

Among five parallels listed by Perdelwitz,[3] ἀναγεννάω appears only once, in the fourth chapter of Salutius, *De diis et mundo* (ἐπὶ τούτοις γάλακτος τροφὴ ὥσπερ ἀναγεννωμένων) in which descriptive statements of the Mysteries are given. While this is rather a late source (A.D. 4th century), ἀναγεννάω used here seems to correspond to *renatos* of Apuleius' *Metamorphosis* XI:21, describing the Isis-cult.[4] That the idea of rebirth is found in the conceptual circle of the Mysteries and is probably of a pre-Christian date, or at least contemporaneous with N.T. times, would seem likely.[1]

---

[1] Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung . . .," pp. 51-52.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefes*, pp. 42-44. Cf. Büchsel in *TWNT*, I, 671-672.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

It seems to be notable that the idea of rebirth is closely associated with the *taurobolium*, an initiation rite. The rebirth, enacted by the rite, "in a magical way ensures the votary a higher knowledge," and it also enables him to attain "a higher life, or the divine nature."[2] In addition to the point just noted, the rebirth of the Mysteries appears to be closely related to the idea of transfiguration, expressed with words such as μεταμορφοῦσθαι and μεταβαλλέσθαι,[3] or θεωθῆναι and ἀποθεωθῆναι.[4]

6. In addition to the parallels listed above, there are possible parallels in 'Gnostic' circles[5] as

---

[1] Büchsel, *TWNT*, I, 672. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe*, p. 30. H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions* (London/New York/Toronto: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913), pp. 68-114; esp. pp. 69-70 and 96. Dey, *ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ*, pp. 36-128.

[2] Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des l. Petrusbriefes*, p. 45; Cf. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 94 ff.

[3] Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistische Mysterienreligionen* (3rd ed.; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956), pp. 39-40 and 262-265.

[4] Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

[5] We shall follow Dodd in defining 'Gnostic' or 'Gnosticism'as a "label for a large and somewhat amorphous group of religious systems described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus in their works against Heresy . . ., and

attested in the Early Church Fathers[1] and also in Libellus XIII of the *Corpus Hermeticum*.[2] Ode 36 ('The Rebirth through the Spirit before the Most High in the heavens') of the Odes of Solomon may also be taken into consideration.[3] While these appear to constitute notable parallels to the idea of rebirth as found in I Ptr. 1:3 (23), there seems to be difficulty in assuming the latter's direct dependence upon the former: on the one hand, the probability of dependence on the Gnostic parallels seems to be undermined in view of the definition of 'Gnostic'-- 'Gnosticism,' with regard to which we follow Dodd's definition.[4] The same line of

---

similar systems known from other sources." (C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: The University Press, 1960], p. 97).

[1] We owe the following references to the Early Church Fathers to Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (*HTKNT*; Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953), p. 161: Hipplytus, *Refutatio Ominum Haeresium* V:8:23 (ἀναγεννηθέντες πνευματικοί, οὐ σαρκικοί); Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 76:4 (ἀναγεννώμεθα); 80:1. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I:1:11. Clem. Alex., *Stromateis* III:4:30 (υἱοὶ φύσει τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ); IV: 165:3; *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 2:2 (τὸ σπέρμα τὸ πνευματικόν).

[2] *Hermetica* (ed. Walter Scott [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924] , Vol. I, p. 238). Cf. Dodd, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 44ff. Also Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, pp. 103-114.

[3] A German translation of Ode 36 may be found in: Edgar Hennescke-Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck --, 1964), Vol. II, pp. 616-617.

[4] Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 97. We shall not exclude the possibility that some of the conceptual features characteristic of 'Gnosticism' may be traced back to various

consideration would pertain to the case of Odes of Solomon, which appear to be a 'Gnostic hymnal of the second century, A.D.'[1]

As to the parallel in the Corpus Hermeticum, we shall follow Dodd, who maintains judiciously that the idea of rebirth as propounded in Libellus XIII, along with the same idea in Christian sources, belong to a "common background of thought."[2]

These parallels may be set aside from our consideration of the history-of-concept background, from which the Petrine idea of rebirth might have been derived.

As to possible history-of-concept parallels we may sum the matter up as follows:

1. In the literature related to the O.T.-Jewish tradition of faith there are a few instances, though small in number, of parallels to the idea of rebirth of which the active subject is God. A notable set of parallels may be found in Deut. 32:18; Josephus,

---

[1] W. Bauer, "Die Oden Salomos" in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, Vol. II, p. 577. There Bauer offers relevant bibliographical details.

[2] Dodd, The In Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 53. Cf. also his The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1954), pp. 240-241 and 243-248.

Schelkle suggests that 'rebirth' (παλιγγενεσία) in Libellus XIII might have been influenced by Tit. 3:5 and I Ptr. 1:3 (Die Petrusbriefe, p. 30). A similar view to Schelkle's is maintained by W. Grundmann (Die Gotteskindschaft in der Geschichte Jesu und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen [Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938], p. 23).

Antiquities, IV:47:319 and Cant.R. 8:2. In these parallels the idea is employed with an explicit or implicit reference to the covenantal relationship which God concluded with His chosen people Israel at His own initiative.[1] However, an emphasis on the fresh, or renewed, nature of the birth as implied in the ἀνά-prefix[2] is not closely represented in these parallels.

2. One of the other possible areas of contact is the conceptual milieu of the Mysteries, to which the addressees of I Peter must have been at least exposed.[3]

Now, the purpose of the Mysteries is summed up by Kennedy in terms of raising the "soul above the transcendency of perishable matter to an immortal life through actual union with the Divine."[4] While it seems difficult, in view of notable terminological and conceptual differences,[1] to assume a direct history-of-concept relationship between the Petrine idea of rebirth and that in the Mysteries, it appears possible that the seemingly emphatic use of three adjectives with the *ἀ-privative* (i.e, ἄφθαρτον , ἀμίαντον , ἀμάραντον in 1:4),[2] as well as the choice of ἀναγεννάω to designate Christian rebirth, might have been due to an implicit polemical intention of a certain Christian circle, which might have felt the menace of the Mysteries, and in which the basic outlook of the Petrine eulogical formula may be traced. If this is the case, as seems possible, then we have, in the Petrine idea of rebirth, a glimpse of the evangelizing/apologetic situation of the early

---

[1] The terminology as found in I Ptr. 1:3-4 (e.g., 'living hope' and 'inheritance') seems to stand close to the O.T.-Jewish tradition of faith (cf. Bultmann and Rengstorf in TWNT, II, esp. pp. 518-527; also J. Herrmann in TWNT, III, pp. 768-775; with regard to I Ptr. 1:23, see, e.g., Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, pp. 251-253). The absence of 'living hope' or 'inheritance' or an equivalent expression from the idea of rebirth in the Mysteries seems to be more than conspicuous.

[2] Cf. Liddell-Scott, pp. 97-98 (on ἀνά).

[3] Cf. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions, pp. 94-95.

[4] Ibid., p. 79.

---

[1] The following differences may be noted:

1. There is no piece of positive evidence, as noted elsewhere (cf.p.169), that ἀναγεννάω (I Ptr. 1:3, 23) was used in the circles of the Mysteries of (or before) the first century A.D. to designate the new status of initiates.
2. Conceptually speaking, the idea of rebirth in the Mysteries seems to be closely related to the idea of 'transfiguration,' or to some means of contact/union with deities, with the idea of 'deification' (on the close relationship between *reformari* and *renasci* in Apuleius, see Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, pp. 262-265). These two ideas (i.e., transfiguration and deification) are not integral to the Petrine idea of rebirth.
3. The idea of rebirth in the Mysteries presupposes, as a duly performed rite of initiation, esoteric rites such as the *taurobolium* (cf. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, pp. 94ff.). Even assuming that the Petrine idea of rebirth has an implicit baptismal allusion, we cannot detect any trace of an esoteric implication attached to Christian baptism.

[2] Cf. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefes*, p. 49.

Church, which took the prevalence of the notion of rebirth in the Mysteries as an occasion to sharpen and to define distinctly its expression of 'self-understanding in faith.'

3. The Rabbinic use of the imagery of the 'newborn babe' to characterize the proselyte seems to be worthy of note (B.T. Yebamoth 48b). One of the problems with this parallel is that it is of a later date: Rabbi Hananiah's view, which Rabbi Jose (ca. A.D. 150) opposed, is dated ca. A.D. 120.[1] This seems to suggest that, despite the far-reaching Jewish propaganda and proselytizing activities during early N.T. times (cf. Matt. 23:15),[2] there were divergent views as regards the status of proselytes. So far as the given evidence goes, the possibility of tracing Rabbi Jose's view back to an earlier date seems to be counter-balanced by the date of Rabbi Hananiah's view. Thus it appears difficult to regard Rabbi Jose's view as constituting the immediate history-of-concept background of the Petrine idea of rebirth.

---

[1] Str.-Bill., Vol. I, pp. 929-930. Cf. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1960), p. 170. Barrett notes the legal implication of the Rabbinic parallel.

[2] Cf. Adolf Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, E.t. and ed. by James Moffatt (Harper Torchbooks edition; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), pp. 9-18. Leonhard Goppelt, Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954), pp. 39 and 80.

Of the three parallel ideas mentioned above, the one entertained in the circles of the Mysteries seems to stand out as the most likely history-of-concept parallel to the Petrine idea of rebirth; the immediate context of the latter seems to suggest that it was formulated with an implicit polemical intention against the Mysteries. This does not necessarily mean that the idea itself was taken up from the conceptual milieu of the Mysteries. Instead it seems that, as we shall see soon, one may look for a piece of evidence within the N.T. which might have been an incentive for the early Christian formulation and use of the idea.

B. Now we come to examine, from a history-of-tradition point of view, possible parallels in the N.T. to the idea of rebirth that we find in I Ptr. 1:3, 23. For our present concern the following passages seem to be of primary importance: Tit. 3:4-7, Jas. 1:18; Jn. 3:3ff.; I Jn. 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18. Also Pauline phrase 'new creation' as found in II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15 will be touched upon briefly.

1. I Ptr. 1:3-4 and Tit. 3:4-8.

These two passages seem to form remarkable parallels; similarities shared by these two passages can be brought out better when they are set side by side:[1]

---

[1] We shall follow, in the main, the parallel presentation of these two passages made by Boismard (M. -E. Boismard, *Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre* [Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961], pp. 15-16.

I Ptr. 1:3-4	Tit. 3:4-8
	4. ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ,
3. εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,	
	5. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ
ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς	κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου,
	6. οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως
εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν,	διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν
4. εἰς κληρονομίαν	7. ἵνα δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου.
ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς.	
	(8. Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος .)

Tit. 3:4-7 seems to form a relatively unified passage;[1] this appears to be suggested by some features which would point to a somewhat distinguished place of

this passage from the rest of Titus[1] (and the Pauline epistles), on the one hand, and a possible derivation from certain other traditional material, on the other.[2] "The word is sure"--as found in vs. 8--seems to enhance the possibility of such a derivation (cf. I Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; II Tim. 2:11).[3] This phrase appears to serve as a 'framework term' (Rahmenterminus), and, along with trinitarian references ('God our Saviour,' vs. 4;[1] 'the Holy Spirit' and 'Jesus Christ our Saviour' in vs. 6), seems to suggest the 'formulary' character of the passage, Titus 3:4-7.

---

[1] There may be an antithetical parallel relationship between vss. 4ff. and vs. 3, as Dibelius suggests (Dibelius-Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 110-111). The contrast between the pre- and post-conversion stages as suggested by the parallel passages would possibly be traced back to a certain primitive Christian kerygmatic scheme, based upon a 'missionsgeschichtliche' reflection of the Church (Dibelius-Conzelmann, loc. cit.).

---

[1] Certain terminological similarities between Tit. 3:4-7 and Tit. 2:11-14 may not be denied. See Dibelius's excursus, "Die soteriologische Terminologie von Tit. 2:11ff. 3:4ff." in Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 108-110. However, Dibelius's attempt to see a bearing of his terminological observations upon the question of the authenticity of Titus would seem not to be successful, since, as the formula 'The saying is sure' suggests, Tit. 3:4ff. apparently is a quotation (cf. J. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus [NTD; 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954], p. 65.

[2] The following words are terminologically notable: χρηστότης (in Rom. 2:4; 11:22; Eph. 2:7; Tit. 3:4, in line with the LXX use of the term as attributed to God. Cf. 13:1, 3; 20:3; 24:7; 30:19, etc. Χρηστότης in II Cor. 6:6; Gal. 5:22; Col. 3:12, as part of the 'list of virtues.' Cf. S. Wibbing, Die Tudend- und Lasterkatalog im N.T. (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1959), p. 99); φιλανθρωπία (as an attribute of God only at Tit. 3:4. Cf. Acts 28:2.); λουτρόν (only in Eph. 5:26 and Tit. 3:5, both doubtlessly referring to a baptismal bath. Cf. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser [4th ed.; Dusseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963], pp. 256-257); παλιγγενεσία (as a term designating the renewal--rebirth of the believer only in Tit. 3:5. Cf. Matt. 19:28). The phrase, 'The word is sure' (πιστὸς ὁ λόγος), is conspicuous as we see elsewhere (fn. 1, above).

[3] Cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 23-24. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timetheus und Titus, p. 65. Also p. 13. Jeremias takes the phrase as a 'citation formula.' A similar view to this is held by C. Spicq, Saint Paul, les Épîtres Pastorales (Etudes Bibliques; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1947), p. 281.

Now, besides certain terminological differences (e.g., παλιγγενεσία for ἀναγεννάω),[2] there are, in the Titus passage, some featues which would appear to prevent us from assuming a direct literary relationship between this passage and the Petrine one. First, from a history-of-concept point of view, words such as φιλανθρωπία apparently suggest indebtedness to an (Hellenic-) Hellenistic conceptual milieu,[3] especially possible acquaintance with terminology connected with emperor worship (e.g., σωτήρ as a divine appellation and the use of ἐπιφαίνω , the verb form of ἐπιφάνεια),[4] while such a phrase as κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος (Tit. 3:5;

---

[1] Σωτήρ in vs. 4 appears to be an appellation of God, and not of Christ (Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, p. 77).

[2] The following words or phrases are missing from the Petrine passage: χρηστότης, φιλανθρωπία, ἐπιφαίνω, σώζω, δικαιόω, διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, ἀνακαίνωσις πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἐλπὶς ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

[3] Cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 109. Also Liddell-Scott, p. 1932. Hatch-Redpath (p. 1430) does not register any Hebrew equivalent of φιλανθρωπία (II Macc. 6:22; 14:9; III Macc. 3:15, 18).

[4] Cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-77. Also Foerster in *TWNT*, VII, 1010-1012. However, also pp. 987-988. In the passage last mentioned Foerster cites Rabbinic instances of ישע and גאל , used in the sense of the One who delivered Israel out of Egypt.

κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος in I Ptr. 1:3) may be an echo of an O.T. expression (cf. Num. 14:19; Ps. 25:7; 119:88; Dan. 3:42).[1] With the possible exception of ἀναγεννάω, the features which would suggest a possible (Hellenic-) Hellenistic conceptual milieu (especially possible acquaintance with terminology related to emperor worship) are absent from the Petrine passage.

Secondly, from a history-of-tradition point of view, the Titus passage seems to reflect an acquaintance with the Pauline contrast of 'justification by the works of the Law' with 'justification by faith' (see the antithetical parallelism in 3:5),[2] while it also seems to reveal its indebtedness to a probably pre-Pauline association of baptism (λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας)[3] with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 2:38; 10:40-44; also I Cor. 12:13; II Cor. 1:22).[4] Neither of these two features is represented in the Petrine passage.

---

[1] Boismard, Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre, p. 16.

[2] Rom. 3:28 (cf. 3:20, 30); Gal. 2:16. Cf. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, pp. 53-58. Also Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 96.

[3] Cf. Oepke in TWNT, IV, 308. Oepke says, "λουτρόν ist vielmehr Oberbegriff für die beiden folgenden Genetiv." (Italics Oepke's.)

[4] Cf. H. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte (HNT; Tübingen: J.B.C. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1963), pp. 30-31. Also W. F. Flemington, The N.T. Doctrine of Baptism (London: S.P.C.K., 1964), pp. 43-48. Nevil Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (SBT; Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1956), p. 19. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, p. 69.

Despite these differences, however, there are certain similarities between the Titus and Petrine passages, and these two passages seem to share indirect baptismal allusions. The baptismal implication of the Titus passage seems to become clearer when the passage and Eph. 5:26 are set side by side:

Tit. 3:5	Eph. 5:26
. . . ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου, . . .	ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι, . . .

That λουτρόν and its cognate terms had an assured place as comprising baptismal terminology in the early Christian vocabulary, seems to be borne out by notable instances: Acts 22:16 (ἀπόλουσαι); I Cor. 6:11 (ἀπελούσασθε); Heb. 10:22 (. . . λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ).[1] In Eph. 5:26, the combination of a genitival phrase τοῦ ὕδατος with καθαρίζω seems to make it almost beyond doubt that λουτρόν here refers to baptismal bathing.[2] Since baptism signifies a radical change in the initiates' life, it seems to be natural that baptism comes to be expressed as the 'washing of regeneration' (λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας).[1] If one may assume that ἀναγεννάω and παλιγγενεσία belong to the same 'circle of figurative expressions' (Bildkreis), used to describe figuratively the same reality brought about in the Christian initiates,[2] one may infer an indirect baptismal allusion also from ἀναγεννάω .

---

[1] Cf. Oepke in TWNT, IV, 306-307. Cf. Jn. 13:10; Rev. 1:5.

[2] Cf. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, pp. 256-257. Schlier suggests that ῥῆμα refers to a baptismal formula of confession.

This brief survey of differences and similarities seems to allow one to conjecture that these two passages are dependent upon a certain baptismal expression well known in the early Church, although it seems difficult to define the original Gattung of the alleged baptismal expression.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 111-113. Also Spicq, Les Epîtres pastorales, p. 277.

[2] Cf. Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe, pp. 28-31. Also Dey, ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ , p. 151, 4-6, and 32-35.

[3] Scholars like Käsemann, Preisker and Boismard try to define the Gattung of the passage concerned with reference to a liturgical framework: "ein Stück festformlierter Taufparänese" (E. Käsemann, "Titus 3, 4-7" in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen [3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964] , Vol. I, pp. 298ff.); 'a primitive hymn' (M. -E. Boismard, "Une Liturgie Baptismale dans la Prima Petri," RB, LXIII [1956] , esp. 183ff.) or a 'baptismal hymn' (Boismard, Quatre Hymnes baptismales . . ., esp. pp. 15-26); 'eine belehrende Rede,' or 'didache' (H. Windisch- H. Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, p. 157).

2. I Ptr. 1:3-4 and Jas. 1:18

The James passages read as follows:

> βουληθεὶς [1] ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχήν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων.
> (Deliberately He begat us by the word of truth so that we should be a kind of first fruit of His creatures.)

Jas. 1:18 forms, with vs. 17, a unit within vss. 2-18.[2] Terminological[3] and stylistic[4] features of these two verses seem to suggest that they are dependent upon certain traditional early-Christian material.

Scholars are divided on the question of whether vs. 18 refers to the first, cosmic creation or to the new status of Christians. The first view has recently found an advocate in Elliot-Binns.[5] The second view as maintained by Ropes,[1] Dibelius-Greeven[2] and, most recently, Mussner,[3] seems to commend itself better than the former; the cosmic frame of reference, within which Christian redemption is conceived (noted the expression 'a kind of first fruit of His creatures.'), does not seem to require the former view. The following points may be noted:

---

[1] On the word, cf. James H. Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), p. 165. Also Franz Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief* (*HTKNT*; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1964), pp. 93-94.

[2] "Do not be deceived" (vs. 16) would possibly be a formula to introduce a quotation (cf. I Cor. 15:33). M. Dibelius-H. Greeven, *Der Brief des Jakobus* (*KEK*, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 95. The use of ἡμᾶς may also be noted.

[3] The following words and a phrase are *hapax-legomena* in the N.T.: παραλλαγή, ἀποσκίασμα, τροπή, πατὴρ τῶν φώτων. Ἀποκυέω is found elsewhere only in Jas. 1:15. The adverbial use of βούλομαι is found nowhere else. Cf. δόσις (also in Phil. 4:15); δώρημα (also in Rom. 5:16).

[4] Vs. 17 represents a hexameter. See Dibelius-Greeven, *loc. cit.* and pp. 24-25. Also Musser, *op. cit.*, p. 90, fn. 4.

[5] L. E. Elliot-Binns, "James I.18: Creation or Redemption?" *NTS*, III (1956-57), 148-161. Cf. Carl-Martin Edsman, "Schöpherwille und Geburt Jac 1, 18," *ZNW*, XXXVIII (1939), 11-44.

1. The context of vss. 17-18 does not necessitate that vs. 18 be a reference to the cosmic creation; the verse and its context harmonize better if one regard them as referring to the new status of Christians.

2. There are few parallels of ἀποκυέω as used of the creation.[4]

3. λόγος ἀληθείας appears to be an idiomatic phrase denoting the Gospel message (Eph. 1:13; Col. 1: 5; II Tim. 2:15. Cf. II Cor. 6:7).[5]

---

[1] Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, p. 166.

[2] Dibelius-Greeven, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, pp. 99-102.

[3] Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief*, pp. 92-97. Cf. H. Windisch- H. Preisker, *Die katholische Briefe*, pp. 9-10.

[4] Ropes, *loc. cit.* While objecting to Ropes's view by referring to the figurative use of 'begetting' (with possible connection with creation) in Philo, Elliot-Binns admits fairly that the application of the figurative expression "to redemption is just as close" as to creation (Elliot-Binns, "James I.18: Creation or Redemption?" p. 151).

[5] Dibelius-Greeven, *op. cit.*, p. 100. Cf. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, p. 69. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Brief an die Kolosser und Philemon* (*KEK*, 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954, p. 26. J. N. D. Kelly, *A*

4. The somewhat abrupt use of ἡμᾶς seems to suggest that the author is appealing to some sort of well-known expression alluding to baptism;[1] a possible allusion to baptism seems to be suggested by the combination of ἀπεκύησεν and λόγος ἀληθείας .[2] To these ἀπαρχή may also be added; this term seems already to have been part of Christian vocabulary designating the earliest Christian converts (Rom. 16:5; I Cor. 16:15. Cf. Rev. 14:4).[3] It may be possible that a piece of 'baptismal instruction' underlies the James passage as Mussner suggests.[4]

Now, differences between I Ptr. 1:3-4 and Jas. 1:18 seem to prevent one from assuming a direct literary relationship between the two passages. What concerns us most at present is that the new status of Christians

---

Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963), p. 183. The Pauline phrases have definite articles.

[1] This view will be strengthened if ἀποκυέω refers, as seems probable, to baptism. Cf. Mussner, Der Jakobusbrief, p. 96, fn. 3: "Was Elliot-Binns übersieht, ist der 'formgeschichtliche' Gesichtspunkt (Taufunterricht!)."

[2] Tables of synonymous/cognate expressions are presented by Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 390-391. Cf. Mussner, op. cit., p. 95.

[3] In I Cor. 15:20 Christ is called 'the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep.' Cf. Delling in TWNT, I, 483-484.

[4] Mussner, op. cit., pp. 95-96.

is expressed figuratively by the imagery of God's begetting, and that a baptismal allusion may be inferred from the expression. These two features seem to suggest that the two passages concerned are dependent upon a certain baptismal expression well known in the early Church.

3. I Ptr. 1:3-4 and the Johannine parallels

The Johannine parallels may be listed as follows:

> Jn. 3:3, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew (or 'from above.' ἄνωθεν),[1] he cannot see the kingdom of God."
>
> Jn. 3:5, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."
>
> I Jn. 2:29, ". . . you may be sure that every one who does right is born of him (γεγέννηται)."
>
> I Jn. 4:7, ". . . and he who loves is born (γεγέννηται) of God and knows God."
>
> I Jn. 5:1, "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is born (γεγέννηται) of God."
>
> Cf. I Jn. 3:9; 5:4, 18 (The phrase ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ is used of the Christian).

---

[1] On ἄνωθεν , see Büchsel in *TWNT*, I, 378. Büchsel points out that this adverb corresponds to מִלְמַעְלָה as found in b. Yoma 39a; (the end of) Sifre Numeri on 7:5; Gen. R.51 on 19:24; Tanchma מעורע 9:43, all of which explicitly or by implication refer to God.

Cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (*KEK*, 15th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 95, fn. 2. Also O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, E.t. by A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance (*SBT*; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1953), pp. 75-78.

is expressed figuratively by the imagery of God's begetting, and that a baptismal allusion may be inferred from the expression. These two features seem to suggest that the two passages concerned are dependent upon a certain baptismal expression well known in the early Church.

3. I Ptr. 1:3-4 and the Johannine parallels

The Johannine parallels may be listed as follows:

> Jn. 3:3, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew (or 'from above.' ἄνωθεν),[1] he cannot see the kingdom of God."
>
> Jn. 3:5, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."
>
> I Jn. 2:29, ". . . you may be sure that every one who does right is born of him (γεγέννηται)."
>
> I Jn. 4:7, ". . . and he who loves is born (γεγέννηται) of God and knows God."
>
> I Jn. 5:1, "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is born (γεγέννηται) of God."
>
> Cf. I Jn. 3:9; 5:4, 18 (The phrase ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ is used of the Christian).

---

[1] On ἄνωθεν , see Büchsel in *TWNT*, I, 378. Büchsel points out that this adverb corresponds to מִלְמַעְלָה as found in b. Yoma 39a; (the end of) Sifre Numeri on 7:5; Gen. R.51 on 19:24; Tanchma מצורע 9:43, all of which explicitly or by implication refer to God.

Cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (*KEK*, 15th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 95, fn. 2. Also O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, E.T. by A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance (*SBT*; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1953), pp. 75-78.

The first two are the statements made by Jesus in His conversation with Nicodemus. The meaning of each statement seems to be supplemented by that of the other; i.e., 'to be born anew' (γεννᾶσθαι ἄνωθεν) means 'to be born of water and the Spirit' (γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος. Cf. vs. 3:8). The conspicuous combination of 'water'[1] and 'the Spirit' seems to suggest that the (re-) birth alludes to the new status of Christians initiated by baptism.[2] The expression, 'to be born anew' (ἄνωθεν), seems to recall a phrase in Jn. 1:13, 'to be born of God' (ἐκ θεοῦ γεννᾶσθαι). The (re-) birth takes place at one's receiving the Logos (cf. ὅσοι . . . ἔλαβον αὐτόν, 1:12), and the reception assures one of the right (ἐξουσία) to be the child of God.[3] That is, 'to be born ἄνωθεν' or 'to be born of water and the Spirit' is akin to the notion of being children of God.

---

[1] Bultmann doubts the authenticity of the phrase 'water and' (ὕδατος καί), and in fact is inclined to regard it as a piece of ecclesiastical redaction (*Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 98, fn. 2). His view seems to be closely related to his assumption that the sacramental interest was not integral to the Fourth Evangelist's thought (cf. e.g., *ibid.*, p. 360). Bultmann's view seems to be unwarranted at least from a text-critical point of view (cf. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 76).

[2] Cullmann, *loc. cit.* Cf. Neville Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* (*SBT*; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1956), pp. 27-28.

[3] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), p. 305. Cf. R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (*HTKNT*; Freiburg: Herder, 1953), p. 156. Schanckenburg remarks pertinently that, in the Johannine saying, the Logos is not a '*Zeugungsfaktor*.'

From a history-of-tradition point of view, a notable parallel to Jn. 3:3, 5 is found in Matt. 18:3 ("Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." RSV). It seems to be plausible, as Dodd suggests, that the Johannine saying "may have reached him [the Fourth Evangelist] in a form very similar to, but not identical with, that which reached Matthew."[1] At any rate, it seems to be probable that the Fourth Evangelist is, in Dodd's terms, "building upon earlier tradition, whether it reached him orally or through the other gospels."[2]

In I John the idea of 'being born of God' is employed as a notion correlative to the view that Christians are children of God (3:1, 2, 10; 5:2). The writer of I John does not say explicitly how this birth takes place; he is concerned rather with stating various kinds of conduct suited to Christians ('to do right,' 2:29, 'not to commit sin,' 3:9; 5:18, 'to love' and 'to know God,' 3:9, 'to believe that Jesus is Christ,' 5:1, 'to overcome the world,' 5:4) as the "moral consequence of being born of God," in Schnackenburg's terms.[1]

---

[1] C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), p. 359. As to the history-of-concept parallels, Dodd says that the idea of (re-) birth "has no roots in the Old Testament, nor any very convincing analogy in Jewish thought of the period." (Ibid., p. 358) This remark seems need of some qualification in view of the parallels surveyed above (pp. 162-164).

[2] Ibid., p. 359. Cf. Flemington, The N.T. Doctrine of Baptism, pp. 85-88; esp. p. 87.

The matter-of-fact manner of using the idea, 'being born of God,' and the combination of the idea with that of Christian behaviour seem to suggest that the idea may have had an assured place in the Johannine circle especially as part of a parenetic expression well known in the circle. From a history-of-tradition point of view, it seems to be possible that the idea as found in I John may be traced ultimately back to the *verba Christi*, so deemed and represented in the 'earlier tradition,' Jn. 3:3, 5.[2]

Now, the differences between I Ptr. 1:3-4 and the Johannine parallels seem to be obvious: first, terminologically speaking, I Peter has ἀναγεννάω (1:3, 23), while Johannine parallels are expressed either by γεννᾶσθαι ἄνωθεν (or γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος) or γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ ; such motifs as 'God's great mercy,' 'living hope,' 'resurrection of Jesus Christ' or 'inheritance' as found in the Petrine passage do not appear in the Johannine parallels or in their immediate context. Secondly, conceptually speaking, rebirth in I Peter takes place by means of the 'living and abiding word of God' (1:23); but in the Fourth Gospel the means of new birth are 'water and the Spirit' (3:5). Thirdly, from a Gattung-analytical point of view, I Ptr. 1:3-4 seems to closely reflect a eulogical formula, while Jn. 3:3, 5 may be classified under a general heading of 'Sayings' as Dodd proposes;[1] the parallels in I John may reflect a well-known parenetic expression in the Johannine circle as we have suggested elsewhere.[2] Thus it seems to be difficult to assume a direct literary relationship between I Peter on the one hand, and the Johannine parallels on the other.

---

[1] Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe*, p. 156.

[2] As to the relation between I John and the Fourth Gospel, see the succinct discussion by Schnackenburg, *ibid.*, pp. 28-33. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles* (*MNTC*; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1961), pp. xlvii-lvi. Further, A. Wikenhauser, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (3rd ed.; Basel/Freiburg/Wien: Herder, 1959), pp. 377-379.

Despite these differences, there is a notable similarity: the imagery of rebirth--new birth, of which the active subject is God, is used to designate the new status of Christians. Since this new status is signalized by baptism as an initiation rite, the imagery may be regarded as alluding to Christian baptism (Jn. 3:5 seems to have a clear allusion to it). While it may be difficult to decide on the history-of-tradition priority between the two groups of 'rebirth' expressions,[1] it appears probable that, at least in some quarters of the early Church, the idea of rebirth (-new birth) was common enough to find different formulations or usage to designate the new status of Christians.

---

[1] Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 315-420.

[2] See p. 189. Note the use of imagery of a newborn babe in a parenetic context, I Ptr. 2:2-3.

4. Pauline parallels

Among the possible parallels in Pauline (-deutero-Pauline) epistles to the Petrine idea of rebirth,[2] one of the notable ones would be the idea of

---

[1] Schnackenburg, for instance, regards I Peter as one of the earlier N.T. writings, and takes the use of the motif of rebirth in the Epistle as indicative (along with Jas. 1:18 and Tit. 3:5) of the fact that the primitive Church (Urkirche) at a relatively early date took up the motif "as an analogy of the redemptive event (Heilsgeschehen)" which occurs to believers at baptism,--though without developing it into fixed conceptions (Die Johannesbriefe, p. 162). He seems to suggest that the parallel idea in I John would be dependent upon the primitive Christian usage, while he does not specify to which parallel I John stands closest.

Schnackenburg thinks it difficult to say whence the primitive Church drew its main impetus for applying this imagery to baptism. He regards it as unquestionable that baptism was originally associated with remission of sins especially in contrast to the baptism of John the Baptist. On the other hand, a way to a deeper view of baptism must have been opened, so Schnackenburg thinks, by the view of Christian baptism as a baptism of the Spirit. A relationship of this latter view with Jesus' words to Nicodemus may be assumed, according to Schnackenburg, unless traditions of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel are to be totally discredited (loc. cit.).

[2] From a viewpoint of the Petrine idea of rebirth as a baptismal allusion, the following passages may be noted: Rom. 6:3ff.; I Cor. 1:13-17; 6:11; 10:1-3; 12:13; 15:29; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 5:26; Col. 2:12. As to history-of-tradition problems related to these passages: cf. e.g. Otto Kuss, "Zur paulinischen und nachpaulinischen Tauflehre im N.T.," Theologie und Glaube, XLII (1952),

'new creation' (καινή κτίσις) as propounded in II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15 (cf. Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10).[1] We shall limit ourselves to commenting briefly on this idea of 'new creation.' There seem to be two basic questions related to this idea: a question of history-of-concept background and that of a possible history-of-tradition relationship.

As to the first question, we follow the scholars[2] who maintain that the Pauline idea of 'new creation' has conspicuous parallels in O.T.-Jewish eschatological expressions,[3] especially in the Rabbinic comparison of the proselyte to a new creature.[4] Since in Rabbinic literature the proselyte is also compared to a 'newborn babe,' as we have noted elsewhere,[5] it would be possible

---

401-425. O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, pp. 128-131. Georg Braumann, *Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverkündigung bei Paulus* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1962). Also Flemington, *The N.T. Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 72-73.

[1] Cf. E. De Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), esp. p. 356. Burton there argues that "the antithesis to περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία favours the verbal (actional) sense."

[2] Str.-Bill., II, 421-423 (on Jn. 3:3); III, 519 (on II Cor. 5:17). Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (*KEK*, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), pp. 208-209. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 119-122.

[3] E.g., Isa. 43:19; 65:17; 66:12; Jer. 32:22; Jubilee 1:29; 4:26; 5:12; II Baruch 32:6; 44:12; 57:2; Enoch 72:1; Mekilta 51b on Ex. 16:5; Targum Onkelos on Deut. 32:12.

[4] Gen.R.39:4. Cf. b.Yebamoth 48b. [5] See pp. 168.

that both Paul and I Peter drew upon the Rabbinic parallels, while adopting different expressions. There are, however, two things which seem to lessen the possibility: first, history-of-concept parallels to the Petrine idea of 'rebirth' are, as we have surveyed them elsewhere, not limited to Rabbinic ones, and it appears difficult to regard Rabbi Jose's view (i.e., comparison of the proselyte to a newborn babe) as constituting the immediate history-of-concept background of the Petrine idea of rebirth. Furthermore, there seems to be hardly anything in I Ptr. 1:3-4 (,23) (and in its immediate context) to suggest that the status of proselytes was looked upon as an example of that of Christian converts. Secondly, 'new creation' is employed in the Pauline epistles with a traditional eschatological outlook, which seems to be represented in O.T.-Jewish parallels.[1] But Rabbinic use of 'new creation' as referring to proselytes seems to be merely a figure of speech without having that particular historical outlook. Thus it seems difficult to explain not only the Petrine idea of rebirth, but also the Pauline idea of 'new creation,' from the viewpoint of a possible derivation from the Rabbinic parallels.

---

[1] Cf. Paul Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba (Tübingen/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck --, 1903), pp. 55-68. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, pp. 189-191. Also Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 36-57.

The brief observations we have just made seem to have a bearing upon the issue of a possible history-of-tradition relationship between the Pauline 'new creation' and the Petrine 'rebirth.' If Rabbinic parallels (a) could have formed the common history-of-concept background of 'new creation' (b) and 'rebirth' (c), there would be two possible history-of-tradition relationships: i.e., either a→b→c or a→c→b. Since common derivation from the Rabbinic parallels, as we have remarked above, does not seem to be an assured proposition, a possible history-of-tradition (as well as literary-critical) relationship will have to be decided upon, primarily, on the basis of literary-critical consideration. While sharing a common frame of reference (i.e., to denote a radical change which affects Christians when they assume their new status), these two ideas and their immediate contexts seem to exhibit considerable differences:

First, from a terminological point of view, one of the conspicuous differences is precisely the use of 'new creation' and 'rebirth.' Their exclusive use, in the Pauline epistles and in I Peter, respectively, seems to make the difference more remarkable.

Secondly, from a context-analytical/conceptual point of view, the following points may be noted:

In comparison with II Cor. 5:17, a motif of reconciliation is absent from the immediate context of the

Petrine rebirth. Likewise, a contrast between 'old' and 'new' is not explicit in the Petrine context. As to the Christological reference in II Cor. 5:17 (and in its immediate context, vss. 16-21), a special emphasis is given to the significance of the Passion of Christ, in whom 'God reconciled the world to Himself,'--while in the Petrine context, there is instead an explicit reference to the resurrection of Christ (1:3).

In relation to Gal. 6:15, we note that, within the immediate context of Petrine rebirth, there is no allusion to the antithetical relationship between 'justification by the works of the law' and 'justification by faith' (Gal. 2:17) which seems to be recapitulated (with regard to an actual menace facing the Galatian church) in reference to an enforcement of circumcision (6:12ff.). Paul's Christilogical reference is made explicitly to the Cross of Christ, while in the Petrine context, there is, as we have noted in the preceding paragraph, a reference to the resurrection of Christ.

Thus, unless these differences are explicated in terms of conscious alteration by one (i.e., the Petrine 'rebirth'/the Pauline 'new creation') of the other (i.e., the Pauline 'new creation'/the Petrine 'rebirth'), it seems difficult to assume a direct history-of-tradition, or a literary, relationship between the Petrine 'rebirth' and the Pauline 'new creation.' These differences seem to point to the fact that various expressions for the new status of Christians were formulated in the early Church, apparently without their having any direct history-of-tradition relationship to each other.

Now, we may sum up the outcome of our brief observations in this sub-section B as follows:

1. Tit.3:4-7; Jas. 1:18; Jn. 3:3, 5 and passages in I John (2:29; 4:7; 5:1, cf. 3:9; 5:4, 18) seem to comprise notable parallels to the idea of rebirth as propounded in I Ptr. 1:3-4 (and vs. 23). In view of various literary-critical differences, it seems to be difficult to assume a direct history-of-tradition, or a literary, relationship between the Petrine passage(s) and these parallels. However, all these parallels are evidently concerned with denoting the new status, or the radical change, which is brought about in the initiate, and directly or indirectly they connote a baptismal allusion. In this regard, these parallels seem to form a distinct 'circle of figurative expressions' (Bildkreis).[1]

2. The Pauline phrase 'new creation' also seems to belong, in the sense that it also is concerned with denoting the status of Christian initiates, to a similar category of expressions. However, there are some literary-critical/history-of-concept problems which seem to

---

[1] Cf. e.g., Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe . . ., pp. 28-31.

prevent us from assuming a direct history-of-tradition relationship between this phrase and the Petrine idea of rebirth; it is difficult to interpret the differences between the two in terms of a thematic development of one from the other.

3. After all, one cannot exclude the possibility that the N.T. idea of (re-)birth may be traced back ultimately to the saying of Jesus, so deemed and represented in Jn. 3:3ff.[1] This does not mean, of course, that the piece of saying tradition underlying Jn. 3:3ff. was out of touch with the conceptual milieu of the contemporary Graeco-Roman world.[2] As a reference to the 'kingdom of God' seems to suggest,[3] however, the saying of Jesus represented in the Johannine passage seems to reflect an old saying tradition which is paralleled, e.g., in Matt. 18:3 (cf. Mk. 10:15; Lk. 18:17). It seems to be possible that in some theological quarters this piece of traditional saying of Jesus functioned as an incentive to denote figuratively, along with the sacramental action of baptism and an interpretation attached to it by the baptisant, the new status Christians acquire at conversion. Actual phraseology of the

---

[1] Cf. Schnackenburg, Die Johannesbriefe, esp. pp. 161-162.

[2] Cf. Flemington, The N.T. Doctrine of Baptism, p. 87.

[3] Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 358-359.

idea of (re-)birth found in the parallels may have depended at least in part upon the kerygmatic (/apologetic/polemical) intention or situation of a particular community. In the case of the Petrine idea of rebirth, the phraseology of the passage(s) seems to suggest that the idea is propounded there with an implicit polemical intention against the prevalent idea of the Mysteries.

CHAPTER IV

A FRAGMENTARY THEO-LOGICAL FORMULA IN 1:17a

In this verse there seems to be a fragmentary reflection of a traditional theo-logical expression. The passage, with which we are concerned at present, reads as follows:

> εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸν ἑκάστου ἔργον , . . .
> If you invoke as Father him who judges each one impartially according to his deeds, . . .

It may be admitted at the outset that in this brief passage there are two starata of theo-logical references: i.e., God the impartial judge and God the One who is said to be invoked as 'Father.' It seems possible that these two strata originally formed one piece of theo-logical expression. It is also possible (and perhaps more likely) that these strata had already existed separately and were combined by the Petrine writer.[1] At any rate, these two strata are to be treated as separate units. While we shall take them up together in Section 1, we will be concerned, in Section 2, primarily with the motif of God as an impartial judge.

---

[1] We shall present a suggestion to explain the combination later.

SECTION 1

Preliminary Observation

In this section we shall consider the following question: are there any features to suggest the 'traditional formulary' character of vs. 17a?

There do seem to be a few literary-critical features to suggest an outstanding place of vs. 17a in I Peter; they may be listed as follows:

1. 'Επικαλέω is a hapax-legomenon in our Epistle. There are parallels elsewhere in the N.T. of ἐπικαλέω with apparent or implicit liturgical connotations (e.g., Acts 2:21; 7:59; 9:14, 21; Rom. 10:12, 13, 14; I Cor. 1:2; II Tim. 2:22; Heb. 11:16), while admittedly no parallel in the N.T. to the fact that here ἐπικαλέω takes πατέρα (= God) as its complement.[1]

2. 'Απροσωπολήμπτως is a hapax-logomenon in the N.T.,[2] while cognate terms/expressions are used in

---

[1] Hort thinks that πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε "may be taken together as only a more precise ἐπικαλεῖσθε " (Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 72-73). He bases his view on the fact that usage of the double accusative is not often found in the Bible (exceptional cases in Jer. 3:19; II Cor. 1:23; also in the Classical writers), and that ἐπικαλεῖσθαι "retains its full force of 'invoke,' 'appeal to for aid.'"

Against Hort Selwyn rightly maintains that Hort's view does not bring out the exact meaning of πατέρα in its given context, since the sense of the protasis is 'if you invoke the impartial Judge as Father,' and not 'God, whom you call "Father," is an impartial Judge.' (Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 42. Cf. Bigg, The Epistle of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 117).

[2] Cf. Ep. of Barnabas 4:12 (ὁ κύριος ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον. ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται). Also I Clem. 1:2.

relation to God's impartiality (e.g., προσωπολήμπτης in Acts 10:34; προσωπολημψία in Rom. 2:11; Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25).[1]

3. A context-analytical *aporia*, which vs. 17 represents, seems to bear out further the outstanding place of the verse. Together with the imperative which follows (vs. 17b), the *protasis* in vs. 17a forms an independent exhortatory unit in a series of brief exhortations (vss. 13-23),[2] and a context-analytical *aporia* may be seen in the fact that vs. 17 is not in a sequence of thought in the series of exhortations;[3] i.e., the exhortatory units in vs. 13 and vss. 14-15 form by

---

[1] To these parallels we shall return later.

[2] Schneider thinks that vss. 17-21 contain a "piece of Christian preaching," or the basic assertions about God and Christ (Johannes Schneider, *Die Kirchenbriefe* [*NTD*, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961], pp. 53-54). His view finds its precursor in Windisch who has maintained that vss. 17-21 contain a "beautiful reproduction, in a binitarian form, of the evangelical kerygma in four double lines." (Windisch-Preisker, *Die katholische Briefe*, p. 56).

With Schneider and Windisch one can agree that theological and Christological themes are represented in these verses. In fact, these verses composed an extended sentence (*Satzperiode*) as Schelkle points out (*Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., p. 47). But one may question whether the verses concerned actually constitute, as Schneider and Windisch seem to imply, one integral unit from the viewpoints of context-analysis and of analysis of traditional material.

[2] Schelkle thinks that there is an orderly development of a theme 'exhortation on filial fear' in vss. 17-21 (*Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., p. 47). Even a casual look at these verses from a context-analytical point of view will not warrant Schelkle's view.

themselves integral units , vss. 18-19 seem to represent, as we shall see later, a traditional formulary piece; the motifs propounded in the preceding and following units are not emphasized in vs. 17.

These three features as well as possible parallels in the N.T.[1] seem to suggest that in vs. 17a we have a piece of traditional theo-logical formulation (composed of two strata).

The formulary character of the participial clause τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον seems to be suggested by the use of participial construction which denotes God and by the parallels found elsewhere in the N.T.

With regard to (εἰ) πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε , the same character seems to be suggested by the verb ἐπικαλεῖσθε , which serves here as a 'framework term' (Rahmenterminus) suggesting that πατέρα is the substance as well as the object of a liturgical-formulary epiklesis;[2] there are, in the N.T., a number of instances of ἐπικαλέω with distinct or implicit liturgical connotation.[3] The second person plural of ἐπικαλεῖσθε seems to suggest that an epkilesis in terms of 'Father!' was a well-known liturgical expression to the addressees of I Peter (or at least so understood by the Petrine writer).[1]

---

[1] To the parallels we shall return in the following section.

[2] Delling defines epiklesis as an "appeal, or a call (Anruf), in the sense of confession," and refers to Acts 22:16; I Cor. 1:2 and Rom. 10:14 as parallel instances (Der Gottesdienst im N.T., p. 111. Cf. pp. 110f.).

[3] The cases in which God is the object of an epiklesis, are Acts 2:21 and Rom. 10:13, both of which quote

The *Gattung* of τὸν . . . κρίνοντα κτλ. will be elucidated later, along with our examination of parallels to this participial clause. The original *Gattung* of πατέρα may have been a liturgical-formulary *epiklesis*, although this definition may not exclude the possibility that this particular appellation of God was made familiar, e.g., by a customary, liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer.[2]

SECTION 2

A History-of-Tradition Examination

A. Before we go into a history-of-tradition examination proper, as to the motif of God as an impartial

---

Joel 3:5. Αὐτόν in Rom. 10:12 also designates God (cf. Rom. 9:11 Isa. 28:26). Christ is the object of an *epiklesis* in Acts 7:59; 9:14, 21; 22:16; I Cor. 1:2. An invocation of Christ's name in Acts 22:16 is specifically related to the administration of baptism. Cf. K. L. Schmidt in *TWNT*, III, 498-501. Also Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., p. 47. Hans Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (*HNT*; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1963), p. 29.

[1] See Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6. On Rom. 8:15, cf. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, pp. 228-229. On Gal. 4:6, cf. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, pp. 139-140; and fns. 1-2 on p. 140. 'Abba-Father!' seems most likely to be a pre-Pauline appellation of God.

[2] Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 73. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 13. Cf. Delling, *Der Gottesdienst im N.T.*, pp. 72-73.

judge, we shall survey briefly the history-of-concept parallels of this motif, and take up one literary-critical problem.

That the history-of-concept milieu of the idea of God's impartiality formulated in I Ptr. 1:17a and in parallel passages in the N.T. can be sought in an O.T.-Jewish expression, seems to be suggested pre-eminently by the word formation. The adverb in 1:17a, ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, consists of a negative prefix ἀ- and προσωπολήμπτως, a compound word made up with πρόσωπον and adverbial λήμπτως, a derivative of λαμβάνω.[1] This adverb, as well as its cognate terms such as προσωπολημψία, προσωπολήμπτης, προσωπολημπτέω, appears to be an almost _verbatim_ rendering of a Hebrew idiomatic phrase _נָשָׂא פָנִים_,[2] though with Hellenistic (word-composition) traits,[3] or representing a more refined stage of the Grecicizing process of a Semitic idiom.[1]

---

[1] J. H. Moulton - W. F. Howard, _A Grammar of New Testament Greek_ (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960), Vol. II, pp. 246-247 and 106.

[2] _נָשָׂא פָנִים_ is also rendered by θαυμάζω πρόσωπον in the LXX (e.g., Deut. 10:17; II Chron. 19:7; Job 34:19). Another Hebrew clause, _הִכִּיר פָנִים_ (γινώσκω πρόσωπον), is used synonymously to _נשׂא פנים_, and rendered also by αἰδέομαι πρόσωπον (Prov. 24:13) and αἰσχυνέομαι πρόσωπον (Prov. 28:21).
Cf. Lohse in _TWNT_, VI, 780.

[3] Cf. Moulton-Howard, _op. cit._, p. 275. Howard says, "The compound (with -ψία and -πτέω) serves as a good illustration of the fact that word-composition was a resource of language still very much alive in Hellenistic."

Now, נָשָׂא פָּנִים is sometimes used in an affirmative sense, meaning 'to give special favour' (e.g., Gen. 19:21; 32:21; I Sam. 25:35; II Kg. 3:14; Job 42:8, 9; Mal. 1:8, 9, etc.).[2] Within the context of the so-called Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26), this phrase appears as part of an injunction against partial judgment (Lev. 19:15b);[3] the same usage is found, e.g., in Ex. 23:6 and Deut. 1:17; 16:19b (לֹא תַכִּיר פָּנִים).[4] The cases in Deut. 10:17 and II Chron. 19:7 are noteworthy. There the phrase, נָשָׂא פָּנִים, is used to designate God's impartial dealings with men:

---

[1] Cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, A Grammar of the O.T. in Greek (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909), Vol. I, p. 44.

[2] BDB, p. 670. On Num. 6:25-26; Deut. 32:20 (cf. Micah 3:4; Ps. 12:2; 29:8; 43:25): see Lohse in TWNT, VI, 773.

[3] Cf. Martin Noth, Das dritte Buch Mose (ATD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 122. Noth thinks that Lev. 19:15-18 does not have to do with 'Richterspiegel' (as suggested by Gerhard von Rad, Deuteronomium-Studien [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947], p. 12), but with the "regulations of conduct applicable to all the Israelites. . . ."

[4] Cf. Von Rad, op. cit., pp. 18-20 and 24. On the basis of a form-critical survey of parallel passages Von Rad concludes that "the Holiness Code contains for a predominant part parenetic community instructions, and these community instructions are based on various older ordinances." (Op. cit., p. 24.)

> Deut. 10:17, "For the Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords, . . . who is not partial and takes no bribe."

> II Chron. 19:7, "Now then, let the fear of the Lord be upon you; take heed what you do, for there is no perversion of justice with the Lord your God, partiality, or taking bribes."

In Pseudepigraphical writings God's impartiality in His dealings with men, especially in His executing judgment, is explicitly affirmed:

> Jubilee 33:18, "And do thou, Moses, write (it) down for Israel that they may observe it, and do according to these words, and not commit a sin unto death; for the Lord our God is judge, who respects no persons and accepts no gifts."[1]

> II Baruch 13:8, ". . . The judgment of the Lofty One Who has no respect of persons."[2]

> Psalms of Solomon 2:18-19, "Thou hast uncovered their sins, that Thy judgment might be manifest; Thou has wiped out their memorial from the earth. God is a righteous judge, And He is no respector of persons."[3]

In view of these history-of-concept parallels as well as the linguistic features, it may be concluded that the idea of God's being an impartial judge in I Ptr. 1:17a seems to have its rootage in the theo-logical motif well known in the O.T.-Jewish conceptual milieu.

B. One literary-critical problem, which seems to have a bearing upon our history-of-tradition examination of I Ptr. 1:17a (and its parallels), is the use of compound words such as προσωποληµπτέω,[1] προσολήμπτης[2] and προσωπολημψία[3] in the N.T.

---

[1] Charles, APOT, II, 64. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 489.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 633.

These compound words appear for the first time in the N.T. Lietzmann contends the προσωπολημψία in Rom. 2:11 was coined by Paul on the basis of the LXX usage.[4] If that is the case, it would be possible, as Foster does,[5] to explicate ἀπροσωπολήμπτως in I Ptr. 1:17a in terms of its dependence upon προσωπολημψία, attributed allegedly to Pauline coinage. However, the view held by Lietzmann seems to be improbable, because he has yet to account for the following problems:

First, in relation to his insistence upon independence from the Apostles, or 'those who are reputed to be something,' Paul states clearly, though parenthetically, πρόσωπον (ὁ) θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει (Gal. 2:6); i.e., there Paul does not use the compound term allegedly coined by him. How can his use of a different term/expression be explained? Is it to be attributed to chronological factors as regards the dates of the two epistles (i.e., Romans and Galatians)? Or, is it to be attributed to Paul's contextual or literary considerations?

---

[1] Jas. 2:9. [2] Acts 10:34.

[3] Rom. 2:11; Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25; Jas. 2:1. Cf. Polyc. Phil. 6:1.

[4] Hans Lietzmann, An die Römer (HNT, 4th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1933), p. 33. Dibelius seems to agree with Lietzmann's view on the coinage of this word (M. Dibelius - H. Greeven, Der Brief des Jakobus [KEK, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957], p. 118).

[5] O. D. Foster, The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," pp. 427-428.

Secondly, προσωπολημψία is one of three synonymous compound words (προσωπολημπτέω in Jas. 2:9; προσωπολήμπτης in Acts 10:34. Cf. ἀπροσωπολήμπτως in I Ptr. 1:17a). Is Lietzmann limiting Pauline coinage to προσωπολημψία alone? (If so, the coinage of the other two words would still need to be explained.) Or, does he attribute all three compound words to Pauline coinage? (Again, if so, Lietzmann would be obliged to produce evidence for προσωπολημπτέω and προσωπολήμπτης , neither of which appears even in the deutero-Pauline epistles.) If it is assumed by Lietzmann that the use of the two other words is explicable in terms of their dependence upon προσωπολημψία in Rom. 2:11,[1] it is not clear whether or not the coinage of προσωπολημπτέω and προσωπολήμπτης is assumed by him to be attributed to James and Luke, respectively.

Thirdly, the similarity of the basic outlook shared by Rom. 2:11 and Acts 10:34 (i.e., the equal status of Jews and Gentiles before God) seems to be, as we shall see later, more than accidental. Can one assume that Paul's idea directly influenced the details of the speech delivered supposedly by Peter (Acts 10:34-43)? Is it not more plausible to assume, as we shall do later, that these two (i.e., Rom. 2:11; Acts 10:34) depended on a traditional theme, formulated by and current in the early Church?

---

[1] In this case, a history-of-tradition explication is to be made on Jas. 2:1, if not on Eph. 6:9 and Col. 3:25.

The difficulty in giving clear-cut answers to these questions seems to restrain us from the assumption that προσωπολημψία was first coined by Paul; then, the use of cognate terms (including ἀπροσωπολήμπτως in I Ptr. 1:17a) does not require an explanation in terms of its literary dependence upon προσωπολημψία in Rom. 2:11.

This brief remark now leads us to go on to examine the parallels from a history-of-tradition point of view.

C. We shall limit ourselves to taking up the passages which explicitly refer to God as an impartial judge: Acts 10:34; Rom. 2:11; Eph. 6:9 (cf. Col. 3:25).[1]

(a) First, we turn to the instances in Eph. 6:9 and Col. 3:25.

Προσωπολημψία appears in both of these passages. There seem to be at least two things to be noted: first, these passages are part of the section customarily designated as Haustafel (Eph. 5:22-6:9; Col. 3:18-4:1).[1] Secondly, the immediate contexts of προσωπολημψία in these two passages differ from each other: in Ephesians, προσωπολημψία refers to masters' fair dealings with their servants; in Colossians, the same appears in connection with an admonition to servants as regards the just retribution for doing unjust things. Furthermore, in the Colossians passage, the author of the just retribution is not explicitly mentioned, though probably assumed; in Eph. 6:9, αὐτῷ refers to the preceding ὁ κύριος . . . ἐν οὐρανοῖς .

---

[1] There are notable places in the Synoptics which stress Christ's impartiality in His dealings with men: Mk. 12:14 Matt. 22:16 (βλέπω εἰς πρόσωπον); Lk. 20:21 (λαμβάνω πρόσωπον). Taylor notes that these instances of synonymous phrasing "reflect Hebraic idiom" (Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* London: Macmillan & Co., 1959 , pp. 478-479.)

In view of these differences, one may not be so confident (limiting ourselves to these specific parallels) as Mitton is, in assuming that the Ephesian usage was derived from the Colossians passage.[1] Nevertheless, one may suppose with Dibelius[2] and Lohse[3] that the idea of God's impartiality in His dealings with men may have been so commonplace in the parenetic tradition of the early Church, that it could be applied to different lines of injunctions.[4]

---

[1] To examine the Haustafeln represented in the N.T. would go beyond the scope of the present study. The existence of such unified bodies of material compiled for a parenetic purpose seems to have been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt. The following works are worthy of special note: Karl Weidinger, Die Haustafeln (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrische Buchhandlung, 1928); Philip Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism (Cambridge: The University Press, 1940); C. H. Dodd, Gosepl and Law (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), esp. pp. 20-21; M. Dibelius- H. Greeven, An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon (HNT, 3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), pp. 43-50; Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser (4th ed.; Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), pp. 250-252); A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 52-59 and 128-131 . Cf. W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: The University Press, 1964), pp. 360-384. Ehrhard Kamlah, Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im N.T. (WUNT, J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1964).

It is fair to add that negative views have also been expressed on the existence of the Haustafeln (cf. e.g., F. W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter [2nd ed.; Oxford: B.H. Blackwell, 1958], pp. 194-196). What Beare has to present is a cogent exegetical argument to disprove the existence of these unified bodies of material.

Now, as to a possible literary/history-of-tradition relationship between I Ptr. 1:17a and Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25, there seem to be two problems: first, despite its formulary character, the Petrine passage stands outside the specifically parenetic section in the Epistle (2:13ff.). Secondly, the immediate context of the Petrine idea of God's impartiality seems to be different from that of the (deutero-) Pauline instances: in the former, the injunction is addressed to readers in general, and not to separate social classes as in Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25. Furthermore, the Petrine injunction is circumscribed by an awareness that Christians are exiles (see vs. 17b, ἐν φόβῳ τόν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε . Cf. 1:1; 2:11. Also Heb. 11:13);[1] that awareness seems not be be explicitly reflected in the immediate context of the (deutero-) Pauline passages.

---

[1] C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 207-208. Cf. p. 144.

[2] M. Dibelius - H. Greeven, Der Brief des Jakobus (KEK, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 118. Cf. his An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon, pp. 48-50.

[3] Lohse in TWNT, VI, 780, fn. 3.

[4] The differences we have noted between Eph. 6:9 and Col. 3:25 seem to invite questions on the form of parenetic traditions in the early Church. We are in agreement with Lohse, who thinks that certain discrepancies noticeable among the corresponding passages reveal the currency of the parenetic material/traditions in an oral form (Eduard Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im l. Petrusbrief," ZNW, XLV [1954] , esp. 72-85). This alleged oral form may have given flexibility to the material/traditions, so that they could be adjusted to meet a particular parenetic need or purpose. At any rate, the discrepancies seem to suggest that the

In view of these differences, first, it seems difficult to conclude with Foster that the Petrine passage is dependent upon the (deutero-) Pauline passages.[2] Secondly, the immediate history-of-tradition background seems to have to be looked for elsewhere.

(b) The cases in Acts 10:34 and Rom. 2:11 are difficult ones. Let us take up the Romans passage first.

---

traditional parenetic material/(traditions) were not regarded in the early Church as a verbally fixed set of rules.

[1] Cf. K. L. Schmidt, "Israels Stellung zu den Fremdlingen und Beisassen und Israels Wissen um seine Fremdling- und Beisassenschaft," Judaica, I (1945), 269-296. Also Meyer, K. L. Schmidt and M. A. Schmidt in TWNT, V, 840-852, esp. 850.

[2] Foster, The Literary Relations of the "The First Epistle of Peter," pp. 427-428. Cf. E. Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946), pp. 436-437. Percy suggests that certain terminological similarities shared by I Ptr. 1:17 and Eph. 6:9 are not to be taken as indicative of the former's literary dependence upon the latter.

Rom. 2:1-16, to which vs. 11 belongs, forms a logical unit designed primarily for a polemical purpose against Judaism.[1] Vss. 7-8 and vss. 9-10 form two sets of antithetical parallels to paraphrase what appears to be a scriptural quotation in vs. 6;[2] vs. 6 illustrates the motif of God's righteous judgment as set out in vs. 5 (δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ).[3] While stylistic features characteristic of the Cynic-Stoic Diatribe may be detected in Rom. 2:1ff.,[4] the basic theme propounded in this passage (i.e., the just judgment of God) seems to be derived from traditional O.T.-Jewish thought.[5]

---

[1] Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 64.

[2] Rom. 2:6, ὃς ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Ps. 61:13b (LXX), ὅτι σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. . Prov. 24:12, ὃς ἀποδίδωσιν ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ .

[3] Cf. (ὅτι) τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν in Rom. 2:2.

[4] Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), pp. 64ff., esp. pp. 63, 68, 74 and 79, fn. 4. Michel follows Bultmann in noting the style (Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 63).

[5] The notion of God's justice, as combined with mercy, is set out, e.g., in Ex. 36:19; 34:6f. Cf. Deut. 5:9f.; Jer. 32:17-19; Hosea 2:21f.; Dan. 9:7, 9; Ps. 25:8-10 (Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, pp. 386-387).

The phrase δικαιοκρισία τοῦ θεοῦ is paralleled in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings (cf. I Enoch 27:3; 60:6; 93:14; Test. Levi 3:2; 15:2. Also II Macc. 12:41). Schrenk in TWNT, II, 229.

Rabbinic parallels may be found, e.g., in Mekilta, Beshallah 6; Tanchuma (ed. Buber), Mishpatim §4 (Moore, op. cit., p. 379; Str.-Bill., III, 76ff.).

What concerns us here is that Paul propounds the traditional theme of the just judgment of God in relation to his argument about the equal liability of Jews (and Greeks) to the judgment for unseemly conduct. It appears that Paul is reproducing in vs. 11 what was axiomatic in the early Church as regards the place of Jews and Gentiles in the divine plan of salvation. In connection with this remark of ours, what appears to be noteworthy is the phrase 'the Jews first and also the Gentiles,' repeated twice in the preceding verses 9 and 10. This phrase appears also in Rom. 1:16. The outlook represented in this phrase may be seen in Acts 3:26; 13:46, on the one hand, and in Mk. 7:27[1] and Matt. 10: 5-6, on the other hand. A basic problem is what kind of history-of-tradition relationship exists among these parallels.

Mk. 7:27 is part of Jesus' reply to a Syrophenician Woman's request: "Let the children first be filled." That 'children' means Jews, may be inferred from its contrast with 'dogs' (vss. 27-28) applied to Gentiles.

---

[1] Johannes Weiss maintains that Mk. 7:27 echoes Rom. 1:16 (Das Markusevangelium, Vol. I of Die Schriften des N.Ts. [3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917], p. 139. His implicit assumption of a Marcan dependence upon Rom. 1:16 is yet to be substantiated in view of the parallels in Matthew and Acts.

One may follow Taylor[1] and Jeremias[2] in assuming that this verse may reflect a saying of Jesus.

Matt. 10:5-6 is part of the missionary charge Jesus gave to the Twelve: "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (RSV). This is a stern prohibition against the Gentile mission. Jeremias detects Aramaic traits in this saying.[3] Those traits may be regarded as suggesting that this saying reflects a saying of Jesus.

Jeremias' suggestive monograph, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, seems to have elucidated Jesus' attitude toward the Gentile mission. Two features of His attitude as seen by Jeremias are as follows:

First, there is an apparent contradiction in Jesus' attitude: on the one hand, "Jesus limited his activity to Israel, and imposed the same limitation upon his disciples";[4] on the other hand, "Jesus expressly promised the Gentiles a share in the Kingdom of God, and even warned his Jewish hearers that their own place might be taken by the Gentiles."[5]

---

[1] Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 350.

[2] Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations (SBT; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1958), p. 29. Jeremias regards πρῶτον in Mk. 7:27 as secondary (ibid., p. 23, fn. 1).

[3] Ibid., p. 19 (-20), fn. 3.4, 5. [4] Ibid., p. 55.

[5] Ibid.

Secondly, the "incorporation of the Gentiles into the people of God as the result of God's eschatological act of power"[1] was expected by Jesus.

Jesus' view as reflected in Mk. 7:27 and Matt. 10:5-6 seems to represent the negative phase of the first features of Jesus' attitude toward the Gentile mission.

Acts 3:26 is in agreement with the Gospel parallels just noted above. It is part of Peter's speech delivered in the precinct of the Temple immediately after the healing of a lame man; the passage reads:

> God having raised up his servant, *sent him to you first*, to belss you in turning every one of you from your wickedness. (RSV) (Italics mine)

It may be noted that neither in this passage nor in the context of the speech the possibility/legitimacy of the Gentile mission is hinted. This speech by Peter, to which 3:26 belongs, may be regarded as representing the broad outline of the primitive Christian kerygma with some remarks to make the speech suitable to a particular setting to which it is (supposed to have been) delivered.[2] The use of ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ('his servant')[3] in vs. 26 and παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν (αὐτοῦ) ('. . . his Christ should suffer')[1] in vs. 17 may be taken as having been derived from the kerygma.

---

[1] Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, p. 71. Cf. pp. 55-71.

[2] E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (*KEK*, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 174.

[3] O. Cullmann, *Petrus* (2nd ed.; Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli-Verlag, 1960), p. 74. Jeremias in *TWNT*, V, esp. 698ff. Ferdinand Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 385 (-387).

In contrast to these parallels, in Acts 13:46, Paul and Barnabas are reported to have said to the Jews: "It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you." This particular statement is followed by a denouncement of Jewish unbelief and a declaration of the transfer by Paul and Barnabas of their missionary work to the Gentiles.[2] Here, as elsewhere, the history-of-salvation priority of the Jews is affirmed, but it is stated unmistakably that their absolute priority has already passed away, hence the promotion of missionary activity among the Gentiles.

---

[1] Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 385. The motif of ignorance and prediction by the prophets are regarded by Hahn as characteristically Lucan; however, this infinitive clause (παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ) is regarded by him as a traditional fragment. Traces of "old, formulated tradition" are noted by Hahn in vss. 19b, 20, and, in view of ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ, in vs. 26. Vs. 26 owes its formulation, in Hahn's view, to the Lucan writer; however, that Christological appellation and a participial clause ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς seem to suggest to him that Luke is drawing upon a tradition which (on the basis of Deut. 18:15ff.) saw a promised 'new Moses' in Jesus. That ὁ παῖς θεοῦ as a Christological appellation attained an assured place in liturgical expressions, seems to be suggested by a phrase in Acts 4:30, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ (Jeremias in TWNT, V, esp. 700-701. Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 165. Hahn, ibid., p. 386.)

Both Cullmann and Jeremias seem to look for an immediate history-of-concept background of that Christological appellation in the עבד יהוה ideology.

[2] Cf. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity (London: Macmillan & Co., 1933), Vol. IV, p. 159. Also H. Schlier, "Die Entscheidung für die Heidenmission in der Urchristenheit" in Die Zeit der Kirche (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1956), esp. pp. 90-98.

Now, if these instances, which we have surveyed briefly, may be regarded as closely reflecting the outlook which Jesus Himself and the early Church held, one may note three stages of the outlook in them:

1. Jesus regarded it as His own primary task to preach the message of the Kingdom of God to the Jews, though He did not exclude the possibility or legitimacy of the Gentile mission.

2. A limited or negative attitude toward the Gentile mission was also held by the first Christian missionaries in the earliest days of their activity. It seems to be possible that Jesus' own attitude and His missionary charge (Matt. 10:5-6) might have been regarded as normative by those Christian missionaries. It also seems to be possible that an emphatic use of πρῶτον ('the Jews *first*.' Acts 3:26. Cf. Mk. 7:27) may reflect the attitude adopted by the missionaries to whom the possibility or legitimacy of the Gentile mission was becoming an acute issue.[1]

3. Along with the progress of the Gentile mission and the stubborn opposition of the Jews against it, an

---

[1] Cf. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, p. 23, fn. 1. Also Schlier, "Die Entscheidung für die Heidenmission in der Urchristenheit," p. 90.

inclusive formula, 'the Jews first and (then) the Gentiles,' seems to have come to be adopted by the early Church with the awareness that the priority of the Jews came to be relativized by means of the incorporation of Gentile members into the Church. Acts 13:46 seems to reflect this third stage.

To the third stage just mentioned above Rom. 2:9-11 seems to correspond; this passage seems to reflect, first, the understanding of the Church that the absolute priority of Jews can no longer be maintained; the formula, 'the Jews first and (then) the Greeks,' is used to assert, with regard to the eligibility of the Gentiles to salvation, their equal status with the Jews. Secondly, the traditional concept of God's impartial dealings with men now provides a principle of re-interpretation of the idea of the history-of-salvation priority of the Jews.

To sum up: the theme of God's impartiality found in Rom. 2:11 seems to reflect a situation in the early Church, which used this theme as a rationale for asserting the possibility or legitimacy of the Gentile mission. This conclusion of ours seems to be borne out even further when Acts 10:34 is brought into our discussion.

(c) Acts 10:34-35 reads as follows:

> Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality
> (or, "is not a 'respector of persons'"),[1]
> but in every nation any one who fears him and does
> what is right is acceptable to him. (RSV)

These are the opening words of Peter's speech (Acts 10:34-43), which in turn forms part of a larger unit about Cornelius' conversion (10:1-11:18). In view of the unusual length of the unit and the frequent insertion of direct speeches and repetitious statements (e.g., 10:22, 30-32; 11:5-17),[2] there seems to be no doubt that Luke attached a special significance to this conversion.

Now, owing to the literary character of Acts and the literary place of speeches in Acts, Acts 10:34-43 seems to call for, at least, a source-analytical, as well as a history-of-tradition, examination. Dibelius, for instance, regards vss. 34-35 as part of vss. 34-43, all of which are attributed by him to Luke's literary production.[3] The same line of understanding of vss. 34-43 is followed by Haenchen,[1] although Haenchen is more cautious than, and in fact critical of, Dibelius's view as regards the source analysis of the larger unit (10:1-11:18).[2] Haenchen's discussion from the viewpoint of a structural similarity between Acts 10:34-43 and the speeches in the earlier chapters of Acts, as he carries it out in accordance with Dibelius,[3] does not necessarily clarify the history-of-tradition place of the idea propounded in vss. 34-43. The history-of-tradition place, for instance, of προσωπολήμπτης, a *hapax-legomenon* in the Lucan writings, is untouched by Haenchen. Furthermore, the alleged structural similarity which constitutes a premise of the views held by Dibelius and Haenchen, has been subjected to a pertinent criticism by Wilckens.[4] We may follow Conzelmann, who maintains that what we have in vss. 34-35 is a traditional theme, or an "innerkirchliche Reflektion über die grundsätzliche Möglichkeit von Heidenmission."[5] That this speech may have been intended for Christian readers, seems to be suggested by ὑμεῖς οἴδατε . ("You know . . .") in vs. 37, as Wilckens notes.[1] The Sitz of this speech, therefore, seems to have to be sought in a situation of the Church to which the contents of the speech could have been particularly relevant. One of the possible situations which occasioned the formulation of the 'within-the-church reflection,' in Conzelmann's terms, may have been the possibility or legitimacy of the Gentile mission which had become an acute issue in the Church. This assumption seems to harmonize well with the situation described in the passage, i.e., supposedly one of the earliest and most notable conversions of the Gentiles (cf. Acts 8:4-8). If the line of our assumption may be regarded as historically relevant, then the use of the motif of God's impartiality in vss. 34-35 would seem to reveal that this motif, which had already been commonplace in the primitive Christian parenetic tradition,[2] was used as part of an interpretative scheme to assert the possibility/legitimacy of the Gentile mission.

---

[1] The Greek text of vs. 34 reads: ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ θεός .

[2] G. Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (*NTD*, 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 149. Cf. M. Dibelisus, "Conversion of Cornelius" in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by H. Greeven, E.t. by M. Ling and P. Schubert (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 109-122, esp. p. 109.

[3] Dibelius, *ibid.*, esp. p. 110. Cf. also p. 13 and a chapter entitled "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," *ibid.*, pp. 138-185.

---

[1] Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 303.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 308ff.; esp. pp. 312ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 303. Cf. Dibelius, "Conversion of Cornelius," pp. 110-111.

[4] Ulrich Wilckens, "Kerygma und Evangelium bei Lukas," *ZNW*, XLIX (1958), 223-237; esp. 223-227. Cf. his *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), pp. 63-70.

[5] Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 64. Cf. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, pp. 33 and 35.

---

[1] Wilckens, "Kerygma und Evangelium bei Lukas," pp. 226-227. Dibelius seems to take the clause ὑμεῖς οἴδατε (10:37) as a literary device employed by Luke ("The Conversion of Cornelius," p. 111). It seems that Wilckens is right in refuting Dibelius's view.

Wilckens defines the Gattung of Acts 10:34-43 as 'Evangelium,' which is composed of the "amplification and (re-) organization of the original kerygmatic material." (Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte, p. 69).

[2] Cf. Dibelius, Der Brief des Jakobus, p. 118. Also Lohse in TWNT, VI, 780, fn. 3. As a matter of course, the history-of-concept parallels are to be remembered.

This brief study of Rom. 2:11 and Acts 10:34 now leads us to the question of what kind of history-of-tradition relationship exists between these two passages.[1]

Now, with regard to the history-of-tradition relationship there are four theoretical possibilities:

1. utilization of the motif originated with Paul (in this case, the dependence of Acts 10:34 upon the Pauline usage is to be assumed);

2. utilization of the motif originated with Luke, or the author of Acts (in this case, the dependence of Rom. 2:11 upon Acts 10:34 is to be assumed);

3. utilization of the motif originated with both Paul and Luke, but independently from one another;

4. utilization originated from current usage of the motif in the early Church.

Among these four possibilities, the second one is least probable. Paul's dependence on Luke must be almost categorically excluded.

---

[1] It seems difficult to assume a relationship of direct literary dependence between Rom. 2:11 and Acts 10:34, primarily owing to context-analytical and terminological differences.

First, there is a marked difference in the present contextual relation: Rom. 2:11 is related to a line of argument in which Paul emphasizes the theme of the equal status of Jews and Greeks as to righteous judgment upon their conduct, while Acts 10:34 is part of Peter's sppech, of which a main theme is the equal status of Jews and Gentiles as to salvation.

Secondly, προσωπολημψία is used in Rom. 2:11 (Also

As regards the third possibility, a similarity of basic outlook in utilizing the motif (i.e., equal status of Jews and Gentiles) in these two passages, as well as the affinities of the situations which these passages seem to reflect, makes it improbable also that the corresponding manner of using the motif was merely accidental.

With regard to the first possibility, its probability seems to be lessened by the following historical consideration: while the formulation of the basic outlook (i.e., to relate God's impartiality with the theme of an equal status of Jews and Gentiles) seems to presume the rise of the question of the possibility/legitimacy of the Gentile mission, it seems unlikely that the question was first raised by Paul in connection with his missionary work among the Gentiles. Paul is not an initiator of the Gentile mission, though he is certainly one of the representative figures of the mission; it may be presumed that the particular question had already existed prior to Paul's writing the Epistle to the Romans around A.D. 57.[1] This line of historical

---

in Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25. Cf. Jas. 2:1), while προσωπολήμπτης is used in Acts 10:34. We have pointed out elsewhere the difficulties in regarding προσωπολημψία as a word coined originally by Paul.

[1] Cf. Leonhard Goppelt, *Die apostolische und nachapostolische Zeit*, (Lieferung A, Vol. I of *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 41-63. Also Floyd V. Filson, *A N.T. History* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 175-195. H. Schlier, "Die Entscheidung für die Heidenmission," pp. 90-107; esp. pp. 94-95.

consideration will in the main hold true, even if one yield to Goppelt, who maintains that the account of the Gentile mission as described in chapters 8-11 of Acts is "weniger chronologisch als in sachlicher Steigerung angeordnet."[1]

Thus the fourth possibility (i.e., the common derivation from a traditional outlook formulated and current in the early Church) seems to be the most likely. As we have noted elsewhere, a probable _Sitz_ of the formulation of this outlook must, it seems, be sought in a situation in which the issue of the possibility/legitimacy of the Gentile mission had become an acute one. In order to provide a theological basis for this outlook, the traditional motif of God's impartiality comes to be utilized. This motif, however, now carries a new connotation, as it constitutes a theological rationale for accepting the equal status of Jews and Gentiles and for sanctioning the Gentile mission.

From a history-of-tradition point of view, therefore, it seems that we are to recognize two aspects of the motif of God's impartiality:

First, the O.T.-Jewish traditional motif was taken up by the early Church as part of its (theological and) parenetic tradition. This line of utilization seems to be exemplified, e.g., in Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25. Along with this line of utilization, the particular idea of 'impartiality' seems to have become part of an injunction pertaining to interpersonal relationships, as the cases in James (2:1, 9) seem to suggest.[1]

---

[1] Goppelt, _Die apostolische und nachapostolische Zeit_, p. 46. Cf. Stählin, _Die Apostelgeschichte_, pp. 149-160; esp. pp. 149-150 and 157.

Secondly, the motif of God's impartiality, which seems already to have been part of a common core in the early Christian (pre-Pauline) theologico-parenetic tradition, was used to solve a problem that had arisen from the rapid expansion of the Gentile mission and consequent incorporation of Gentile members into the Church. The cases in Rom. 2:11 and Acts 10:34, both of which were surveyed earlier, seem to represent this second aspect of the traditional motif.

(d) To the combined theme of God's impartiality and the equal status of Jews and Gentiles, as represented in Rom. 2:11 and Acts 10:34, our Petrine passage (1:17a) would seem to correspond. With Selwyn and others,[2] we take 'you,' the subject of ἐπικαλεῖσθε , to

---

[1] Cf. Ex. 23:6; Lev. 19:15b; Deut. 1:17; 16:19b.

[2] Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 143. Also pp. 42-47. His view is in agreement with the ones held by the following scholars: Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 7; Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, p. 72; Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.*, pp. 327-329; Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., pp. 1-3.

The view that regards the addressees as composed exclusively of Gentile converts is held by: Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judae*, p. 6; Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*, p. xv; Windisch denote mixed congregations of Jews and Gentiles. This passage seems to suggest that the motif of God's being the impartial judge may have been a common well-known affirmation among the mixed addressees, since in vs. 17a, as noted elsewhere, an emphasis seems to be placed on πατέρα, not on the participial clause.

As to the exact history-of-tradition relationships of Rom. 2:11; Acts 10:34 and I Ptr. 1:17a, one can hardly say anything definitive. Differences among these passages may, at least in part, be attributed to the different situation or intention of the authors or of the speaker, respectively. In view of those conspicuous differences, it scarcely seems possible to determine

---

-Preisker, *Die katholische Briefe*, p. 50; Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, p. 48; Wikenhauser, *Ein Einleitung in das N.T.* (3rd ed.), p. 358; Van Unnik in *IDB*, III, 761-762; Leconte, *Les Epitres Catholiques*, p. 97; Schneider, *Die Kirchenbriefe*, p. 40.

The view that sees the addressees as composed exclusively of Jews is held by B. Weiss, *Der petrinische Lehrbegriff*, pp. 99-114. He has reiterated his view in *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik*, pp. 17-30.

These views seem to be dependent primarily upon two considerations, exegetical and historical. For an exegetical review, crucial passages are I Ptr. 1:14-18; 2:9-10 and 4:2ff., as well as a phrase 'exiles of the dispersion' in 1:1. A supplementary consideration may be directed to the question of how the 'general O.T. character' (represented in the use of O.T. quotations and motifs) is to be evaluated. One of the questions related to the historical consideration is whether the churches in Asia Minor (e.g., ca. 60 A.D.) may be regarded as having been composed exclusively of either one of these two groups. We cannot go into a detailed examination of these problems. With regard to the two main considerations, it seems that neither one of the exclusive views is warranted (see Selwyn and others for pertinent discussion).

which one of these passages might most closely represent the original form of the outlook.

Despite the reservations just stated, it does not appear to be accidental that the explicit formulation of the motif of God's impartiality is found in I Ptr. 1:17a and Acts 10:34, the latter a part of Peter's speech. We have already noted the improbability of Paul's formulating this outlook (i.e., the combination of God's impartiality and the equal status of Jews and Gentiles) himself; rather Paul seems to reproduce a traditional formula in Rom. 2:11 (cf. vss. 9-11). Might one suppose that the formulation of the outlook could have been associated with the name of the Apostle Peter in the early Church?[1] Selwyn seeks to associate the correspondence shared by I Ptr. 1:17a and Acts 10:34 directly with the issue of the Petrine authenticity of our Epistle;[2]

---

[1] This question appears to become acute when one notes that the motif of the Suffering Servant, as represented in I Ptr. 2:21-25, seems to be one of the characteristic features of the Petrine tradition (cf. Cullmann, *Petrus*, p. 76; also Manfred Karnetzki, "Die galiläische Redaktion im Markusevangelium," *ZNW*, LII [1961], esp. 271). It seems to be almost impossible to assume the Petrine authenticity of I Peter (for lucid discussion, see Stibbs-Walls, *The First Epistle General of Peter*, pp. 20-30; also pp. 31-39; Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe . . .*, pp. 11-15); however, would it be altogether impossible to explain the association of Peter's name with this Epistle from the incorporation of the traditional fragments or motifs which could have been specifically connected with his name?

[2] Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, pp. 33ff. Selwyn maintains that the authenticity of our Epistle is "borne out and amplified" by the parallels shared by I Peter and Peter's speeches recorded in Acts. The same line of thought was earlier advanced by Scharfe (E.

this is hard to do in view of the complexity of the traditional elements, as well as the redactoral gloss and adaptation represented in the Epistle. Nevertheless, a possibility for an affirmative answer to the question may not be, after all, excluded.

Scharfe, Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literature, 1893, pp. 73 and 125; also p. 184).

CHAPTER V

A HYMNIC FRAGMENT IN 1:18-19

It seems likely that a traditional hymnodic fragment may be reflected, with redactoral modification, in 1:18-19. The passage with which we shall be concerned, reads as follows:

εἰδότες ὅτι
οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς
    ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου,
ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ.

You know that
you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited
    from the fathers,
not with perishable things such as silver or gold,
but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of
    a lamb without blemish or spot (RSV).

SECTION 1

Preliminary Observation

This section will be directed primarily toward detecting a traditional hymnodic fragment in this passage. There are two questions to be taken up:

1. What are the features to suggest reflection or

presence of a 'traditional formulary' piece in this passage?

2. If its reflection or presence may be confirmed, what is the Gattung of the 'traditional formulary' piece?

A. Let us take up the first question. It may be answered on the basis of the following two considerations: first, linguistic and context-analytical features which suggest separation of the passage from the rest of I Peter, and secondly, 'formulary' features that seem to meet the criteria which we have set up.

From a linguistic point of view, the following points seem to distinguish vss. 18-19 from the rest of I Peter (and the N.T.):

1. The substantival use of the adjective φθαρτοῖς in vs. 18 is not paralleled anywhere else in I Peter (cf. ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς , 1:23).[1]

2. Ἀργύριον (vs. 18), λυτρόω (vs. 18), ματαιός (vs. 18), τίμιος (vs. 19), ἀμνός (vs. 19), ἄμωμος (vs. 19) and ἄσπιλος (vs. 19) are all hapax-legomena in I Peter.

3. Χρυσίον (combined with ἀργύριον) as a means of ransom is not paralleled elsewhere in I Peter (cf. χρυσίον in 1:7; 3:3).

---

[1] Cf. Blass-Debrunner, § 264 (p. 166). The instances of φθαρτός are notable in I Cor. 15:53, 54, where τὸ φθαρτὸς τοῦτο is used to denote the earthly human existence. Adjectival use is paralleled in Rom. 1:23; I Cor. 9:25.

4. Πατροπαράδοτος is a *hapax-legomenon* in the N.T.

5. A combination of τίμιος and the 'blood of Christ' is unparalleled elsewhere in the N.T.

6. The use of ἄσπιλος as an attribute of a lamb is not paralleled in the N.T.[1]

From a context-analytical point of view, the following observation may be made: vss. 18-19 seem to constitute an extended remark attached to vs. 17, the latter, as we have already observed before, comprising a self-contained unit of exhortation. A sequence of thought, which our Petrine writer would be seeking to establish between vs. 17 and vss. 18-19, might possibly be noted, with Daniélou, between the two motifs, 'time of (your) sojourning' (vs. 17) and 'being delivered out' of the domain of the 'vain ancestral conduct' (vss. 18-19);[2]

---

[1] Cf. ἄσπιλος in I Tim. 6:14; Jas. 1:27; II Ptr. 3:14. Also Ex. 12:5.

[2] Cf. Jean Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri* (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1950), pp. 140-141. Daniélou sees in I Ptr. 1:13-2:10 a rich representation of the 'new Exodus' motif, and thinks that the passage is the text of a homily addressed to neophytes during the Paschal week (cf. M. -E. Boismard, "La typologie baptismale dans la première épître de saint Pierre," *Verbum Salutis*, XCIV [1956] 339-352). Daniélou's view, which relates (part of) I Peter to the Pschal observance of the early Church, has been seconded, e.g., by Cross (F. L. Cross, *I Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*, 1954). A problem with Daniélou's view is that he seems to assume the (*Gattung*-analytical) unity of 1:13-2:10; so far as we can see, he does not allow any room even for redactoral modification. He seems to owe us an explanation as to the relation between the incorporation of an alleged homily into the present context and the literary integrity of I Peter. Thornton's critical remark on Cross's work, especially directed at the problem of literary integrity, seems to be pertinent to Daniélou's view also.

however, this sequence does not seem to be explicit. Furthermore, the Christological formulation in vs. 20 apparently stands outside a strictly logical sequence of vss. 18-19: while vs. 20 is concerned primarily with stating the foreknowledge and appearance of Christ (i.e., it is Christological in character), vss. 18-19 are concerned with describing the redemption of Christians (i.e., they are soteriological in character). The introduction of vs. 20 seems to have been occasioned by a single 'association of ideas,' i.e., by mentioning Χριστοῦ in vs. 19.[1] The fact that vs. 20 is distinguished from its antecedent verses as regards its neatly arranged parallel structure, may be taken to corroborate this supposition.

Our judgment of the passage from linguistic and context-analytical points of view appears to be further confirmed by the conspicuous phrase εἰδότες ὅτι in vs. 18. This phrase seemingly suggests, at least to our Petrine writer, and possibly to his intended readers, that what follows ὅτι (i.e., οὐ φθαρτοῖς κτλ.) is already a well-known statement.[1]

---

[1] The development of thought on the part of our Petrine writer seems not infrequently to progress by an association of ideas, not by a logical sequence; e.g.,

1:19, τιμίῳ αἵματι . . . Χριστοῦ
1:20, (Χριστοῦ), προεγνωσμένου . . . δι' ὑμᾶς
1:21, (a) (ὑμᾶς) τοὺς . . . εἰς θεόν
(b) (τὴν πίστιν) ὑμῶν . . . εἰς θεόν.

The observations we have made above seem to lead us to see vss. 18-19 as an unusal unit in I Peter (and in the N.T.). This remark is now to be related to the following consideration of the 'formulary' character of the verses in question.

With regard to this formulary character, the following features may be noted:

1. The idea of the redemption of Christians is expressed in the framework of an antithetical parallelism.[2] The use of οὐ . . . ἀλλά is to be noted in this regard.

2. The two-part components of the parallelism have an almost even syllabic structure.[3]

---

[1] Cf. I Ptr. 5:9. Also Matt. 22:16; Lk. 20:21; Jn. 3:2; 9:31; Rom. 2:2; 3:19; 7:14; 8:22, 28; II Cor. 5:1; I Thess. 4:15ff.; I Tim. 1:18; I Jn. 3:2; 5:18ff. See Johannes Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte (København: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1954), p. 119, fn. 103. Also Norden, Agnostos Theos, p. 271, fn. 1.

Rom. 13:11, a parallel instance to I Ptr. 5:9, seems worthy of note: the language of the 'Wächterruf,' composed rhythmically, may have been dependent upon traditional apocalyptic material (O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 291).

[2] The mode of expression in this passage, i.e., to put a negative idea first and then a postive one, may be taken as an instance of Semitic style (cf. Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 444). Taylor's remark is made about an identical construction in Mk. 10:45. One may comment in passing that a notable word, λύτρον (cf. ἐλυτρώθητε in I Ptr. 1:18), appears in the Marcan passage; to this word we shall return later.

[3] Cf. Schattenmann, Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus, esp. p. 3, fn. 1. This point will be

As to the first question, one may conclude that linguistic, context-analytical and formulary features seem to suggest that in vss. 18-19 we have a traditional[1] formulary piece.

B. Next a *Gattung*-defining problem arises. Since there is no definite clue available in this passage itself for defining its *Gattung*, it is possible to take the passage as a (Christological) credal formula.[2] It seems to be, however, more probable that the piece is properly an hymnodic piece, or a '*Danklied*.'[3] The following points seem to suggest its hymnodic character:

---

elucidated in connection with our reconstruction of the original hymnodic fragment back of vss. 18-19.

[1] The 'traditional' character will be delineated in the next section, which will be comprised of a history-of-tradition examination.

[2] Cf. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 75. Hort regards εἰδότες ὅτι as an "appeal to an elementary Christian belief." Also see Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, p. 77, and Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe . . .*, p. 51. Schelkle defines the *Gattung* of 1:18-21 as a '*Christusbekenntnis*.'

[3] Karnetzki ("Die galiläische Redaktion im Markusevangelium," *ZNW*, LII 1961 , 271) thinks that the passage 1:18-21 is one of the '*Christuslieder*.' It seems to be questionable whether the passage Karnetzki designates does constitute one homogeneous unit as he suggests (cf. Schelkle, *op. cit.*, p. 51). We shall limit ourselves to noting the following points: first, vss. 18-19, 20 and 21 seem to present different syllabic structure and parallelisms. Secondly, vs. 21 especially, which is theological, seems to be clothed with extensive redactoral modifications: e.g., τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς is an editorial gloss to take up the preceding δι' ὑμᾶς , which also may be a gloss; the dependent clause, introduced by ὥστε , likewise seems to be a tautologically constructed redactoral gloss. We are in agreement with Schelkle (*op. cit.*, p. 51) in our identification of

1. almost even syllabic structure,[1]
2. an antithetical structure used as a literary device,
3. a figurative manner of speech, and
4. the contents of the passage which express Christian self-understanding in faith (we shall shortly seek to change the person of ἐλυτρώθητε).[2]

C. If the antithetical parallelism, which follows ὅτι , closely represents an hymnodic piece, as seems probable, one would expect the original person of

---

these glosses.

Views close to ours (i.e., in defining the *Gattung* of vss. 18-19 as a hymnodic piece) are expressed by J. Schneider (*Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes* [*NTD*, 9 th ed.; 1961] , pp. 54-55) and by Schelkle in his earlier work [*Die Passion Jesu* (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1949] , pp. 234-235).

[1] Cf. Schattenmann, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus*, p. 3, fn. 1.

[2] This fourth point may be regarded as one of the important characteristics that distinguishes hymns and other liturgical forms (e.g., prayers, eulogies) from schematized credal formulae. A basic feature of such formulae are its orderly, indicative and/or descriptive statements about God/Christ/the Holy Spirit, whereas liturgical forms (e.g., hymns) may have a similar content, but in these forms content is presented usually in a reflective manner, referring allusively, if not explicitly, to the relevance of that content to one's own 'existence in faith.' Among the most characteristic examples of Christian hymns, one may enumerate the following passages: Lk. 1:46-55, 67-79; 2:29-32; Eph. 5:14.

Of course, this remark of ours is not meant to deny the hymnodic character of the primarily doxological ascriptions of praise found in Revelation (4:8, 11; 5:9-10, 12; 15:3-4). Cf. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," p. 220.

ἐλυτρώθητε to have been the first person plural; the first person as well as the plurality would harmonize better with the 'liturgical' character of the hymnodic piece. The transfer to the second person plural may have originated with our Petrine writer's hortatory purpose in the present context. In keeping with ἐλυτρώθωμεν, the original form of ὑμῶν would then have been ἡμῶν.

The pleonastic ἀσπίλου would seem to be due to the desire of the one who originally composed the hymnodic piece to establish an even syllabic structure. If an 'even syllabic structure' would have been, to the poet, a cardinal factor in composing formulary material into such a hymnodic piece as we have in vss. 18-19, one may conjecture that ἐλυτρώθωμεν once stood immediately after Χριστοῦ.

On considering these facts together, one might then have the following as a reconstructed hymnodic piece:

(εἰδότες ὅτι)
οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ,
    ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ἡμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου,
ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου
    καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ ἐλυτρώθωμεν.

In view of the absence of an expression of thanksgiving or praise (which would be integral to a 'hymn'), one may assume that what we have in the reconstructed piece is part of a larger unit. The motif of redemption may lead one to conjecture that a baptismal setting would have been a possible Sitz im Leben of this hymnodic fragment.

The outcome of our study in Section 1 may be summed up as follows:

1. There are features to suggest that we have a hymnodic fragment in vss. 18-19.
2. By noting redactoral modifications and assuming the possibility of transposed words, one seems to be able to reconstruct the fragment, which forms a neat antithetical parallelism with an almost even syllabic structure.
3. From the motif of redemption, one may infer a baptismal setting as a possible Sitz im Leben.

SECTION 2

A History-of-Tradition Examination

In the reconstructed hymn there are several notable words and motifs which seem to have a bearing upon our knowledge of the history-of-tradition relationships of this piece. In this section we shall be limited to examining the following two items, i.e., (1) the redemptive significance of the blood of Christ, as formulated in the clause ἐλυτρώθωμεν . . . αἵματι Χριστοῦ ; and (2) the idea of futility expressed by the word μάταιος .

A. To start with, let us examine ἐλυτρώθημεν . . . αἵματι Χριστοῦ .

With regard to this clause there are the following ambivalent considerations: on the one hand, only two other instances of λυτρόω exist in the N.T.; i.e., Lk. 24:21; Tit. 2:14;[1] moreover, the combination of λυτρόω with αἵματι Χριστοῦ , the means of redeeming Christians, is nowhere explicitly paralleled. On the other hand, one does find a number of cognate or synonymous words to λυτρόω in the N.T. (λύω, ἀπολύω , λύτρον , ἀντίλυτρον , λύτρωσις , λυτρωτής , ἀπολύτρωσις ; also ἀγοράζω and ἐξαγοράζω); likewise there are a number of references to the blood of Christ, in the N.T., with or without

---

[1] The fact that λυτρόω is not used in the Pauline epistles, and that the only cognate word used in the epistles is ἀπολύτρωσις (Rom. 3:24; I Cor. 1:30. Cf. Eph. 1:7; Rom. 8:23), may have a bearing upon our assessment of the history-of-tradition background of the idea of 'ransom' as represented in I Ptr. 1:18 and Tit. 2:14.

Foster, who is inclined to give a fairly high degree of probability to the literary dependence of I Peter upon the Pauline epistles, can ascribe to them only lesser degrees of probability with regard to I Ptr. 1:18-19, while he gives higher degrees to the non-Pauline parallels:

I Ptr. 1:18	c	Gal. 3:13 (Foster, *The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter,"* p. 413.
I Ptr. 1:18	d	I Cor. 6:20; 7:23 (*ibid.*, p. 418).
I Ptr. 1:18	d	Eph. 4:17; 1:7 (*ibid.*, p. 452).
I Ptr. 1:18-20	b-c	Heb. 9:12, 14, 24-25 (*ibid.*, p. 480).
I Ptr. 1:19	b-c	I Jn. 1:29 (*ibid.*, pp. 522-523).
I Ptr. 1:18-19	b-c	Jn. 1:29 (*ibid.*, p. 526).

explicit soteriological implications.[1]

In view of these problems, we shall limit ourselves to examining the following:

1. the use of λυτρόω in Tit. 2:14,

2. the idea of redemption in Rom. 3:24-25 (whether of pre-Pauline origin or not), and

3. the possibility that Mk. 10:45 (and 14:24) may contain one of possible sources for the use of this idea.

(a) As we have noted elsewhere, λυτρόω is used also in Lk. 24:21: "But we had hoped that he was the one to redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel." This is part of the disciples' reply to Jesus on the way to Emmaus. This passage will not detain us here, although it too seems to present interesting history-of-concept and history-of-tradition problems.[2]

---

[1] Matt. 26:28; 27:4, 24, 25; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20; Jn. 6:53, 54, 55, 56; 19:34; Acts 5:28; 20:28; Rom. 3:25; 5:9; I Cor. 10:16; I Cor. 11:25, 27; Eph. 1:7; 2:13; Col. 1:20; Heb. 9:12, 14; 10:19, 29; 12:24; 13:12, 20; I Ptr. 1:2; I Jn. 1:7; 5:6, 8; Rev. 1:5; 5:9; 7:14; 12:11.

[2] The outlook represented in this statement (Lk. 24:21) seems to resemble an O.T.-Later Judaistic eschatological view (cf. Ps. 130:8; Isa. 41:14; 43:1, 14; 44:22ff.; 52:3; 62:12; 63:9; Ps. Sol. 8:30; 9:1; 17:42-46; I Macc. 4:11). See Procksch in TWNT, IV, 333. Str.-Bill. IV, 860-862. It may be noted that, as far as available evidence suggests, there is no other instance of the belief, besides Lk. 24:21, that the Messiah himself will be a 'redeemer of Israel'; this title is ascribed exclusively to God in the O.T. and related literature.

A variant reading of ἠλπίζομεν in Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem 4:43 seems to suggest that we have, Tit. 2: (13b-) 14 seems to present a notable parallel to the Petrine verses. These two passages may be set side by side:

I Ptr. 1:18-19	Tit. 2:13b-14
(vs. 19) τιμίῳ αἵματι . . . Χριστοῦ	καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,
(vs. 18) . . . ἐλυτρώθημεν ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ἡμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου , . . .	ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον , . . .

Now, Tit. 2:11-14[1] appears to reproduce a piece of formulary material,[2] as a theological basis for the

---

in this Lucan passage, an Aramaic word סבר which may mean either sperare or putare (Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospel and Acts 2nd ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954 , pp. 181-182). Can this be taken as indicative of the origin of the particular expectation expressed in Lk. 24:21 in an Aramaic-speaking milieu?

[1] The 'relative' integrity of Tit. 2:11-14 seems to be suggested by the following features: 1) a context-analytical aporia which this passage induces: i.e., this passage is sandwiched between parenetic-exhortatory passages (vss. 1-10 and vs. 15); despite the hortatory nature of the ἵνα -clause in vs. 12, vss. 11-14 take account of the significance of God's redemptive work in Christ, as a basis (in an indicative mood) for their hortatory context. 2) The use of an indicative in vss. 11-14 contrasts with an imperative mood in vss. 1-10 and vs. 15. 3) The conspicuous use of a relative pronoun ὃς (of which the antecedent is Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) may suggest the formulary character of vss. 11-14.

[2] Cf. Spicq, Les Épîtres Pastorales (Paris: J. Cabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1947), p. 262. Spicq regards the passage Tit. 2:11-15 as a 'hymn in praise of God.' But, on the following grounds, it seems unlikely that the passage as a whole, as designated by Spicq, is one homogeneous unit: first, vs. 15 can hardly be regarded as part of the alleged hymn; this verse by itself comprises a hortatory unit. Secondly, the long ἵνα -clause in vs. 12 seems to retain a distinctly hortatory

preceding parenetic section, or Haustafel (2:1-10).[1] Within this larger unit, vss. 13b-14 seem to represent a traditional Christological formula with one redactoral addition.[2] The following points seem to support our view: first, vss. 11-14 are divided into a neat binitarian scheme; i.e., vss. 11-13a, theo-logical, and vss. 13b-14, Christological.[3]

---

connotation, and therefore, not to be likely to be a part of hymnodic material.

[1] Cf. M. Dibelius- H. Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe (HNT, 3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), pp. 48-50.

As regards the designation of 2:1-10 as a Haustafel, see e.g., M. Dibelius- H. Greeven, An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon (HNT, 3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), pp. 48-50.

[2] The phrase, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων , appears to be a redactoral addition. The secondary character of this phrase (in the sense of its not being an integral part of the formula) seems to be suggested by the absence of a verb corresponding to the preceding two aorist subjunctives and by the relatively frequent appearance of parallel expressions (i.e., Tit. 2:7; 3:8, 14) in different context.

[3] The remarkable epithet, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν , may be regarded as a phrase to modify the following Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ . A succinct and yet pertinent discussion of the epithet is given in J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1963), pp. 246-247. Cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 108-110.

Secondly, the literary features of the two divisions do not seem to coincide; i.e., all three participles of the passage appear in vss. 11-13a, while ὅς, the antecedent of which is Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, appears in vs. 14.

Thirdly, as regards contents, vss. 11-13a are concerned primarily with the relevance of the grace of God, especially as related to Christian behaviour (note the threefold exhortation implied in the ἵνα-clause), while the division, vss. 13b-14, is concerned with the relevance of Christ's self-sacrifice to the 'existence in faith' of Christians (note the use of two aorist subjunctives in the ἵνα-clause).

Fourthly, there are a number of parallels to this relative clause (i.e., ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ.) with vicarious, redemptive significance of the Passion) and also with regard to linguistic details.[1]

---

[1] An infinitive clause δίδοναι ἑαυτόν seems to be a Greek equivalent of נתן עצמן . Cf. its synonymous expressions such as נתן נפשו על (παραδίδοναι τὴν ψυχήν . Cf. Eph. 5:2, 25) or מסר נפשו על (τιθεναι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπέρ . Cf. Jn. 13:37, 38; 15:13; I Jn. 3:16). H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (*KEK*, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 8, fn. 3. Schlier there refers to Str.-Bill., II, 537 and 740.

As to the use of preposition ὑπέρ, see Rom. 5:8; II Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; Eph. 5:2; I Jn. 3:16. Also Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:19-20; I Cor. 11:24; I Ptr. 2:21, etc. K. H. Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu* (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1949), pp. 133-135. A pre-Pauline origin of ὑπέρ in relation with a soteriological explication of Christ's death seems to be suggested by the use of this preposition in I Cor. 15:3.

These points seem to amount to cumulative evidence in favour of our assuming that in vss. 13b-14 a traditional Christological formula is reflected.

Now, the basic similarities shared by I Ptr. 1:18-19 and Tit. 2:13b-14 may be noted in the following two respects: first, the vicarious significance of the death of Christ is affirmed (cf. ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν in Tit.; a reference to the blood of Christ and the use of ἐλυτρώθωμεν in I Ptr.). Secondly, this vicarious significance is expressed metaphorically, i.e., in terms of 'ransom' (λυτρώσηται in Tit. 2:14, ἐλυτρώθωμεν in I Ptr. 1:18-19).

While a direct literary relationship between these passages may not be assumed, in view of differences in wording and context, the two basic similarities noted above seem to suggest a certain history-of-tradition relationship between them, or more precisely speaking, their common derivation from an early Christian (and probably pre-Pauline) interpretative scheme, which explicates the soteriological significance of the Passion of Christ in terms of 'ransom,' one of the important metaphorical expressions employed for the same purpose.[1]

---

[1] Schelkle lists 'ransom,' 'expiation' and 'offering' as important figurative terms (along with motifs such as 'deliverance,' 'bringing about of Heilsgüter,' and 'founding of the Church') for the early Christian explication of the meaning of Christ's death (Die Passion Jesu, pp. 131-194; esp. pp. 135-149).

(b) To illustrate the probable pre-Pauline origin of the particular metaphorical expression represented in both I Ptr. 1:18-19 and Tit. 2:13b-14, let us examine Rom. 3:24-25. The Greek text of this passage reads as follows:

vs. 24, δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς
ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ·
vs. 25, ὃν (i.e., Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ)προέθετο ὁ θεὸς
ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίσεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι , εἰς
ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν
προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων.

Now, in this passage there are some notable linguistic, syntactical and conceptual features which seem to separate this passage from the Pauline context and to stress its formulary character; they may be listed as follows:

1. Words such as πάρεσις and προγινέσθαι are hapax-legomena in the N.T.

2. Ἱλαστήριον , a word with a strong cultic connotation, does not appear elsewhere in the Pauline epistles (only once in the rest of the N.T.; Heb. 9:5).[1]

3. The participle δικαιούμενοι presents 'syntactical inconcinnity' to use Hunter's term.[2]

4. Δωρεὰν is used here in a different sense from that found elsewhere in the Pauline epistles (cf.

---

[1] R. Bultmann, Theologie des N.Ts., p. 49. Cf. Herrmann in TWNT, III, 301-311.

[2] Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, p. 120.

II Cor. 11:7; Gal. 2:21; II Thess. 3:8. Also Matt. 10: 8; Rev. 21:6; 22:17).[1]

5. The reference to the blood of Christ may be regarded as not characteristically Pauline (cf. Rom. 5: 9; I Cor. 10:16; 11:27).[2]

6. The use of participles (δικαιούμενοι in vs. 24; προγεγονότων in vs. 25) and a relative pronoun (ὅν in vs. 25), of which antecedent is Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, seems to suggest the 'formulary' character of the passage concerned.

7. The several genitival constructions (αὐτοῦ and τῆς in vs. 24; αὐτοῦ twice in vs. 25) and the frequent prepositions (e.g., διά and ἐν in vs. 24; διά, ἐν, εἰς, διά in vs. 25) also seem to be indicative of the 'formulary' character of this passage.[3]

8. Rom. 3:24-25 shares certain conceptual similarities with a synthetical parallelismus membrorum in

---

[1] Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 91.

[2] Bultmann, Theologie des N.Ts., p. 49. It is Bultmann's view that the Cross is the central soteriological factor in Paul's understanding of the Passion. The following direct or indirect references to the Cross may be cited: I Cor. 1:13, 17, 18, 23; 2:2, 8; II Cor. 13:4; Gal. 3:1; 5:11, 24; 6:12, 14; Phil. 2:8; 3:18.

[3] E. Käsemann, "Zur Verständnis von Römer 3:24-25" in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, Vol. I (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 96. As to the genitival constructions and prepositional connections, Käsemann relies upon E. Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe (1946), pp. 191 and (211-) 213. The two syntactical features are also noted by Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, p. 120.

Rom. 4:25, part of a pre-Pauline formulation.[1]

All these features seem to suggest that the references to 'redemption' (ἀπολυτρωσις) and to the 'blood of Christ,' as represented in Rom. 3:24-25, are of pre-Pauline origin.[2]

The point we have made in the preceding paragraph may be carried further. If we recognize with Käsemann that δικαιοσύνη in vs. 25 is an attribute of God to denote His 'covenant faithfulness' (*Bundestreu*),[3] the correspondence between Rom. 3:24-25 and the traditions of the Lord's Supper as represented, e.g., in Mk. 14:(22-) 24 seems to be not merely accidental: in them we see implicit or explicit references to the blood of Jesus and to a covenantal/vicarious meaning ascribed to that blood. Now, two of the few explicit references to the blood of Christ made by Paul (i.e., I Cor. 10:16; 11:27)[4] are associated with the celebration of the

---

[1] One of the similarities may be noted in the association of Christ's vicarious death with the justification of Christians. On the pre-Pauline character of Rom. 4:24-25, see Bultmann, *Theologie des N.Ts.*, p. 49. Also Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, pp. 30-32.

[2] See Bultmann, *loc. cit.* and Käsemann, "Zur Verständnis von Römer 3:24-25," pp. 96ff. Cf. Hunter, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-122. Bultmann even suggests the possibility of the primitive Christian origin of the passage concerned. It is fair to add that Bultmann regards phrases such as δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι (vs. 24) and διὰ πίστεως (vs. 25) as explanatory additions made by Paul.

[3] Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-99. Cf. Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu*, p. 174.

[4] Rom. 5:9 seems to be the only remaining reference to the blood of Christ in the Pauline epistles. As to a

Lord's Supper.[1] With regard to this celebration, Paul himself asserts his own indebtedness to a pre-Pauline tradition of the Last Supper (I Cor. 11:23).[2] Thus it seems that, first, the references to the blood of Christ

---

history-of-tradition possibility, see Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 118-119. Michel suggests that the 'fixed formula' ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ may have been derived from a liturgy of the Lord's Supper.

References to the blood are made also in Eph. 1:7; 2:13 and Col. 1:14, 20. Cf. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 232-237.

[1] Cf. H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II (HNT, 4th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1949), pp. 48 and 57-58. J. Héring, La Première Epître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens (CNT; Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1949), pp. 84-85, and 100-104. For a weighty discussion, see Paul Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl (München: Kosel-Verlag, 1960), pp. 55-60, 69-89, and 201-206.

[2] "For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you." (Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, . . .) On the probable derivation of the technical terms, παραλαμβάνω (קִבֵּר מִן) and παραδίδωμι (מָסַר לְ), from Rabbinical usage, see Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl, p. 84. Cf. pp. 81-82.

In I Cor. 11:23-25 there are some features to suggest the pre-Pauline origin of the description of the Last Supper; we shall follow Neuenzeit, who has contributed one of the most recent and most comprehensive studies on the Lord's Supper, in enumerating the following passages:

1. The expression, ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν, which appears to be a liturgical rubric, seems to have been formed in an analogous way to the contemporary Jewish parallels.
2. The use of κλᾶν without an object appears to be a Semitism. Probably this term might have been a Jewish terminus technicus for the custom of the breaking of bread.
3. The pleonastic use of λαμβάνω seems to be a case of Semitism.
4. The coordinating phrase, καὶ εἶπεν, seems to reflect a Semitic manner of speech. Such particles as δέ and γάρ, which are used frequently elsewhere, do not appear in the account of the Last Supper.
5. There are a few hapax-legomena which do not appear in the rest of the Corpus

and to its (implicit/explicit) convenantal/vicarious meaning might have had, in a pre-Pauline milieu, a fixed place in connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and secondly, the 'fixed place' might have been regarded as having been authenticated, in the minds of participants in the Supper, by its alleged derivation from the *verba Christi*.

(c) In relation to the second point we have made above, let us examine a saying in Mk. 10:45. The text of this passage reads as follows:

> καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.
> (For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.)

One of the difficult issues related to this passage is that of its authenticity. Negative views regarding its authenticity have been expressed, e.g., by Bultmann and Branscomb. It is Bultmann's opinion that what we have in the Marcan passage is the outcome of a 'dogmatic transformation' of a more original form,

---

Paulinum.

a) ἀνάμνησις. Paul's customary expression for this word is μνείαν ποιεῖν (e.g., Rom. 1:9; I Thess. 1:2).

b) the absolute use of ὅσακις and παραδίδοσθαι.

c) μετὰ τό with a substantival infinitive (δειπνῆσαι). Elsewhere, μετά with an accusative (e.g., Gal. 1:18; 3:17. Cf. Tit. 3:10).

d) δειπνεῖν. Elsewhere in the N.T. in Lk. 17:8; 22:20; Rev. 3:20.

Paul Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, p. 86.

represented in Lk. 22:27,[1] and the transformation is supposed to have taken place under the influence of a Hellenistic-Christian teaching of redemption.[2] Branscomb seems to go further, in maintaining that the Marcan verse is a "highly developed theological version of Lk. 22:27, which is influenced by Gal. 3:13; Rom. 3:24 and I Cor. 7:23."[3]

The views held by Bultmann and Branscomb, however, seem to retain several difficult problems which appear to prevent us from accepting the views; those problems may be listed as follows:

1. The alleged representation of a more original form in Lk. 22:27, or a dependence of Mk. 10:45 upon this passage, seems unwarranted on the following grounds:[4]

(a) There are, between the two sayings, differences with regard to the nature of the saying and the context: the Lucan saying is an ethical injunction in nature (cf. Jn. 13:1ff.); 'the Son of man' as Jesus' self-designation and references to His death or to its atoning efficacy are absent from Lk. 22:27 (and from its immediate context, vss. 24-27).[1]

---

[1] Rudolf Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), pp. 97-98.

[2] Ibid., p. 154. A reference is made to W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos (2nd ed.), pp. 7f.

[3] B. H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark (MNTC; New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1937), pp. 190-191.

[4] We shall follow Joachim Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für Viele," Judaica, III (1947-48), 249-264; esp. 259-260.

(b) In addition to this, a source-analytical consideration seems to lessen the possibility of a direct literary dependence between these two sayings: the Lucan passage (vss. 24-27) comes after an account of the Last Supper (Lk. 22:14-23), and this place of the passage seems to suggest that it reflects the structure of the source peculiar to Luke;[2] as a rule Luke closely follows the Marcan order except for dislocations at two points (Mk. 6:17-19; 8:19-21), and these instances of dislocation seems to indicate that Luke keeps the order of the source peculiar to him.[3] It seems that, in Mk. 10:45 and Lk. 22:27, we are in touch with two pieces of traditional sayings independent from each other.[4]

2. An absence of reference to the 'curse of the law' (as found in Gal. 3:13. Cf. Gal. 4:5) or to the 'justification by faith' (as found in Rom. 3:24)[5] from

---

[1] Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für Viele," p. 259.

[2] A supplementary linguistic consideration is given in Reginald Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (SBT; Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1956), p. 57.

[3] Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 259-260. [4] Ibid., p. 260.

[5] As to a probable dependence of Rom. 3:24-25 upon a pre-Pauline formula, see, e.g., Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 120-122. On this Roman passage we have done a brief study in the preceding sub-section (Ab).

Mk. 10:45 (and from its immediate context) and a presence of the motif of service (versus I Cor. 7:23) in the Marcan verse concerned seem to need an explanation from those who maintain the Pauline influence upon Mk. 10:45.[1]

3. The following terminological/linguistic features seem to suggest the pre-Pauline/Palestinian character of the Marcan verse concerned:

(a) One of the indications of the pre-Pauline (or, rather non-Pauline) character of this verse is precisely the use of λύτρον in it. This word does not appear in the Pauline (-deutero Pauline) epistles. Only a compound word ἀντίλυτρον (I Tim. 2:6) and a verb λυτρώσηται (Tit. 2:14) are used in the Pastoral epistles. Admittedly, λύτρον belongs, together with its cognate words, to the same *Bildkreis*, to which words such as ἀγοράζω (I Cor. 6:20; 7:23, 30) and ἐξαγοράζω (Gal. 3:13; 4:5) also belong. Werner appears to be basically right, in maintaining against Holtzmann,[2] that ἀγοράζω in I Cor. 6:20 and 7:23 has no specific reference to Christology or to the death of Christ,[1] while it seems probable that the specifically Christological references of the clause ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς (I Cor. 6:20a; 7:23a) seem to be rounded off by its customary use to denote, soteriologically, the status of Christians.[2] Ἐξαγοράζω in Gal. 3:13; 4:5 is employed with a specific reference to the law; i.e., Christ's redemptive work is to redeem men out of the domain of the law. That this reference to the law is absent from Mk. 10:45, has been noted above (2).

---

[1] With Martin Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1923), pp. 69-70.

[2] Holtzmann suggests the Marcan adaptation of customary Pauline terms such as ἀγοράζω and ἐξαγοράζω (H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* Freiburg/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1911 , Vol. I, p. 363. We owe this reference to Werner, *op. cit*., p. 69.

(b) With regard to the death of Christ, Paul never uses such a phrase as ἀντὶ πολλῶν (Mk. 10:45. Cf. ὑπὲρ πολλῶν in Mk. 14:24).[3] Πολλῶν in this phrase as well as in Mk. 14:24 appears to be a Semitic idiom to denote inclusively 'all.'[4] Paul's customary expressions for ἀντὶ πολλῶν or ὑπὲρ πολλῶν are ὑπερ ἡμῶν (Rom. 5:6, 8; II Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; I Thess. 5:10), ὑπὲρ πάντων (II Cor. 5:14, 15. Cf. I Tim. 2:6), ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων (Rom. 8:31), ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (I Cor. 1:13) and ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (Gal. 2:20).[1]

---

[1] Werner, Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium, p. 69.

[2] Cf. Héring, La première Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, p. 49. Also H. -D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (NTD, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), p. 48. Compare with these H. Lietzmann (-W. G. Kümmel), An die Korinther I/II, p. 33.

[3] Werner, op. cit., p. 70. Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für Viele," p. 259. Cf. Schelkle, Die Passion Jesu, p. 135.

[4] J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, E.t. by A. Ehrhardt (London: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 125. F. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (2nd ed.;

(c) It seems quite unlikely that such a statement as 'The Son of man has come' originated with Paul himself.[2]

4. One of the important features, which seems to have a bearing upon the issue, is the similarity shared by Mk. 10:45 and the Servant poem (Isa. 52:13-53:12). This similarity may be described by the following points:[3]

(a) The clause δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (Mk. 10:45) seems to correspond to אִם־תָּשִׂים . . . נַפְשׁוֹ (Isa. 53:10);

(b) λύτρον appears to correspond to אָשָׁם in Isa. 53:10;

(c) πολλῶν in Mk. 10:45 (and Mk. 12:24) seems to correspond to רַבִּים, which appears five times in the

---

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 58.

[1] Cf. the use of διά in Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 8:11 (cf. I Cor. 8:11) and of περί in I Thess. 5:10 (see Matt. 26:28; I Ptr. 3:18; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10). Schelkle, Die Passion Jesu, pp. 131ff.

[2] Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für Viele," p. 259. Julius Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Markus (NTD, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 143. A. E. J. Rawlinson, St. Mark (WC; London: Methuen & Co., 1925), p. 147.

[3] We shall follow Hahn closely in our list of the similar features (Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 58). Cf. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, pp. 55ff.

Servant poem;[1]

(d) the figure of the Suffering Servant, who "offers himself as an אָשָׁם in compensation for the sins of the people, interposing (himself) for them as their substitute,"[2] and the idea of service, which is to culminate in the vicarious death of the Son of man, seem closely correlative.

In view of these linguistic and conceptual features, one may conclude that Mk. 10:45 echoes the Servant poem. One might take this echoing of the poem as indicative that the saying was a vaticinium ex eventu, or that it was derived from a certain 'community theology' which tried to explicate the significance of the Passion in Isaianic terms. The plausibility of this view, however, seems to be lessened by the following twofold consideration, i.e., that the Marcan version of the Passion narrative is (like other versions) remarkably free from the description of the Servant figure in the poem,[3] and that, as Fuller has rightly pointed out,[4] there are, outside Mark, at least two other sayings of Jesus (i.e., Lk. 12:49-50; 13:32-33) which seem to reflect Jesus' interpretation of His death in the light of the Servant poem.

---

[1] Cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 125 and 148-149. Also Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 444. Fuller thinks that ἀντὶ πολλῶν is closer to לרבים in Isa. 53:11 than to the LXX use of πολλοῖς or πολλῶν in the poem (The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, pp. 57-58).

[2] BDB, p. 80.

[3] Cf. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, pp. 55-85.

[4] Fuller, op. cit., pp. 59-64.

Now, as to the quotations of/allusion to the Servant poem in the Pauline epistles, the following remark may be made: while Paul's free manner of quoting from the Servant poem, without any specific soteriological implication, seems to suggest his thorough familiarity with the poem (Isa. 53:1 in Rom. 10:16; Isa. 52:15 in Rom. 15:21), it seems probable that, when he makes allusions to the poem in two other passages (Rom. 4:25; II Cor. 5:21), Paul is reproducing certain traditional kerygmatic formulations.[1]

Our brief survey of the problems involved in Mk. 10:45 seems to have clarified the following points: first, it seems unlikely that Mk. 10:45 is dependent upon (or, a modified form of) Lk. 22:27. Secondly, the alleged (indirect) dependence of this Marcan verse upon the Pauline passages (e.g., Rom. 3:24; I Cor. 7:23; Gal. 3:13) seems not to be substantiated, for several literary-critical reasons. Thirdly, terminological/conceptual features of Mk. 10:45 seem to suggest that this verse reflects a pre-Pauline, Palestinian background, and that there are conspicuous parallels in this verse to the Servant poem, in the light of which Jesus is regarded as having interpreted His mission, which would culminate in His death.

---

[1] Cf. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, pp. 94-96 and 96-97. Also pp. 97-98. On Rom. 4: (24-) 25, see Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 30-31, Bultmann, Theologie des N.Ts., p. 49, and Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 111-112. All of them agree that, in Rom. 4:(24-) 25, Paul is reproducing a certain traditional kerygmatic formulation.

Quite admittedly, a final word as regards the authenticity of Mk. 10:45 may not after all be pronounced, even in view of the numerous features which seem to indicate its pre-Pauline primitive Christian background. However, the burden of proof (especially with regard to the nature and place of the sayings of Jesus in the pre-Pauline, primitive Church in which the presence of *Ohrenzeugen* to those sayings may well be presumed) is to be borne by those who hold views contrary to its authenticity.[1] Within the limit of the given evidence, what one does seem to be able to say is that the understanding of the Passion of Christ in terms of a vicarious death, or of Christ's offering Himself as a λύτρον, may have found encouragement from a saying represented in Mk. 10:45, which had been cherished as a saying of Jesus in the primitive Church.

---

[1] Hahn, for instance, maintains in accord with Lohse (Eduard Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi*, *FRLANT*, N.F. XLVI 1955 , pp. 116ff.) that in Mk. 10:45 we have 'an interpretation of the primitive Church' (Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, p. 59). Lohse's work, however, has not been available to the present writer at the time of writing.

In the eyes of the primitive Church, which conserved the saying in Mk. 10:45 as part of the repeated predictions made by Jesus Himself (see Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:34), Jesus had already unfolded His interpretation of His own mission-death in the course of His earthly ministry. In the word on the cup of wine at the Last Supper (Mk. 14:24. Cf. Matt. 26:28; Lk. 22:10; I Cor. 11:26) the Church saw an emphatic reiteration of this interpretation,[1] and in His death, a realization of it. It may have been a natural outcome that, first, the redemptive understanding of the blood of Christ came to have its proper *Sitz* in the observance of the Lord's Supper, which was a focal point in the life of worship of the early Church, and secondly, the understanding came to be part of essential constitutents of the kerygmatic (-liturgical) formulations.[2]

The redemptive understanding of the blood of Christ in I Ptr. 1:18-19 is presented in the form of an hymnodic fragment, one of the *Gattungen* of the kerygmatic (-liturgical) formulations; from a history-of-tradition point of view, this understanding may possibly be traced back ultimately to the 'saying of Jesus' (or to what was so deemed by the primitive Church which conserved it) represented in Mk. 10:45.

---

[1] Wellhausen maintains that the transition of themes in Mk. 10:45 (i.e., from the motif of service to that of giving one's life as a ransom) is a "*metabasis eis allo genos*," and suggests that the transition is perhaps explained "aus der Diakonie des Abendmahs, wo Jesus mit Brot und Wein sein Fleisch und Blut spendet." (Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci* Berlin: Druck & Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1909 , p. 85). Wellhausen owes us an explanation of the similarities of outlook exhibited between Mk. 10:45, on the one hand, and the repeated predictions (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:34), on the other.

[2] Among these kerygmatic (-liturgical) formulations one may include Tit. 2:13b-14 and Rom. 3:24-25, both of which we have surveyed in the preceding sub-sections, Aa and Ab.

B. Let us look briefly at the idea of futility expressed with the adjective μάταιος (1:18). In I Ptr. 1:18 the 'way of conduct inherited from the fathers,' out of which Christians are redeemed, is characterized with the adjective μάταιος .

In the Pauline epistles μάταιος appears twice: I Cor. 3:20 and 15:17. In the former passage μάταιος is part of a quotation of Ps. 94 (93):11, "The Lord knows that the thoughts of the wise are futile." The latter passage, I Cor. 15:17, refers to the futility of Christian faith "if Christ is not risen." In view of differences in contextual relations and meaning,[1] it seems difficult to assume the dependence of μάταιος in I Ptr. 1:18 upon either of these Pauline instances.

Among the deutero-Pauline epistles, μάταιος is used in Tit. 3:9, which has to do with an admonition about avoiding 'stupid controversies, genealogies,' etc., since they are 'unprofitable and futile (μάταιοι).' If one assume with Büchsel and others that γενεαλογίας in Tit. 3:9 is identical with (μύθοις καὶ) γενεαλογίαις in I Tim. 1:4 (cf. πατροπαραδότου in I Ptr. 1:18),[1] as seems probable, then in the Titus verse has a polemical reference to Gnosticized Judaism, or the "early Judaizing form of Gnosis" (*judaisierende Frühformen der Gnosis*) as Dibelius calls it.[2]

---

[1] As we shall see presently, μάταιος in I Ptr. 1:18 seems to carry, so to speak, a 'missionsgeschichtliche' connotation as the instances in Acts 14:15 and Tit. 3:9 do also. This connotation seems to be absent from I Cor. 3:20 and 15:17.

The use of μάταιος in Acts 14:15 seems to accord with that in Tit. 3:9. The Acts passage is part of the shout of Paul and Barnabas, and reads ". . . We also are men, of like nature with you, and bring you good news, that you should turn from these vain things (τούτων τῶν ματαίων) to a living God who made the heaven and the earth. . . ." Since the contrast between 'these vain things,' or idols, and the 'living God' appears to have been derived from a liturgical formula based upon O.T.-Judaistic cultic terms (cf. Lev. 17:7; Jer. 8:19),[3] one may conjecture that μάταιος may have attained an assured status as a common term, in the early Christian missionary terminology, to designate anything pertaining to non-Christian religious beliefs and practices. Μάταιος in Acts 14:15 as well as in Tit. 3:9 seems to reflect that particular terminology.

---

[1] Büchsel in *TWNT*, I, 662-663. Spicq, *Les Epîtres Pastorales*, p. 298. Cf. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, p. 255 and pp. 44-46. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, p. 113.

[2] Dibelius-Conzelmann, *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

[3] M. Dibelius, "Herodes und Pilatus" in *Botschaft und Geschichte* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), Vol. I, pp. 289-290. Cf. Bauernfeind in *TWNT*, IV, esp. 526-527. The use of μάταιος in the contrast seems to accord with the characteristic use of this adjective in the LXX: "Das Besondere des Begriffes μάταιος in der LXX liegt . . . darin, dass er uns immer wieder in der jenseitigen Sphäre begnet: μάταια heissen in erster Linie eben die Götter der ἔθνη , also die Götter, die im Griechentum so oder so Garanten des dem μάταιον Entnommenen sind." (Bauernfeind, *ibid.*, p. 527.)

Since μάταιος in I Ptr. 1:18 is applied to the manner of conduct prior to conversion, it seems likely that this term also reflects early Christian missionary terminology. Now, differences in contextual relations seem to prevent us from assuming direct literary relationships among I Ptr. 1:18; Acts 14:15 and Tit. 3:9. The similar usage of μάταιος in these three passages, therefore, seems to suggest that these passages are making use of this term independently from each other.[1]

---

[1] Besides those passages surveyed above, Jas. 1:26 also has μάταιος : "If any one thinks he is religious, and does not bridle his tongue but deceives his heart, this man's religion is vain (μάταιος)." (RSV) However, μάταιος in this verse is used, as in I Cor. 3:20 (Ps. 93:11); 15:17, in a general sense, or as an equivalent of 'barren' (ἀργή . Jas. 2:20) or 'dead' (νεκρά . Jas. 2:26); the adjective does not seem to reflect any specifically '*missionsgeschichtliche*' connotation as inferred from I Ptr. 1:18; Acts 14:15 and Tit. 3:9. Cf. Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief*, pp. 110-112.

CHAPTER VI

A CHRISTOLOGICAL FORMULA IN 1:20

In this verse a traditional Christological formula seems to be reflected. The passage, with which we have to do now, reads as follows:

> (Χριστοῦ , vs. 19)
> προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ,
> φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων
> δι' ὑμᾶς.
>
> He was destined before the foundation of the world, but was made manifest at the end of the times for your sake (RSV).

SECTION 1

A Preliminary Observation

In this section we shall be concerned with detecting and defining a traditional Christological formula in vs. 20. There are two questions to be taken up:

1. What are the features to suggest reflection or presence of a 'traditional formulary' piece in this verse?

2. If the reflection or presence of such a piece should be confirmed, what is its Gattung?

A. Now let us look at the first question. It may be answered from the following two considerations:

first, linguistic and context-analytical features which suggest that this verse stands apart from the rest of I Peter, and secondly, 'formulary' features which seem to meet the criteria which we have already set up.

From a linguistic point of view, the following points seem noteworthy:

1. Προγινώσκω is a hapax-legomenon in I Peter with the exception of its substantival form πρόγνωσις in 1:2. Προεγνωσμένου in vs. 20 refers to Christ's being foreknown by God, while πρόγνωσις in 1:2 refers to God's foreknowledge of Christians.

2. The phrase πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is a hapax-legomenon in our Epistle (cf. Jn. 17:24; Eph. 1:4).

3. Φανερωθέντος here refers to the advent, while φανερωθέντος in 5:4 refers to the παρουσία .

4. The adjective ἔσχατος in vs. 20 refers to the eschatological time which was brought to its fruition at the advent, while the same adjective in 1:5 points to the eschatological (endzeitliche) time, the consummation of which is still awaited in the future.

5. The plural form of χρόνος occurs only in vs. 20, although its singular form is used elsewhere (1:17; 4:2, 3).

In addition to these linguistic features, a context-analytical aporia represented in vs. 20 seems to bear out even further the distinctive quality of the verse under consideration. The indicative statements about

Christ's being foreknown and about His appearing which we have in vs. 20, are not necessitated in the immediate context, since these statements do not seem to accord with a soteriological explication of the Christ-event as propounded in the preceding verses, 18-19, where instead the explication takes the form of self-understanding of Christians. Furthermore, it seems difficult to relate Χριστοῦ and the two participial clauses in vs. 20 with τοὺς κτλ. in vs. 21, because what follows τούς modifies (δι') ὑμᾶς, which appears to be a redactoral gloss for a hortatory purpose. To δι' ὑμᾶς we shall return later.

With regard to the 'formulary' character of vs. 20, the following points seem noteworthy:

1. There are two conspicuous instances of participles (προεγνωσμένου and φανερωθέντος). Both of these participles modify Χριστοῦ in vs. 19.

2. There is a neat parallelismus membrorum, or more properly speaking, a temporal antithetical parallelism composed of two participial clauses.

3. Notable correlative particles, μέν and δέ, are used in this verse.

4. As we shall see later, there are several partial parallels to this verse in the N.T.

As to the first question, therefore, one may conclude that linguistic, context-analytical and 'formulary' features seem to suggest that in vs. 20 we do have a traditional Christological formulary piece.

B. Next comes the second question, i.e., the *Gattung* of the formula.

(a) But before we define the *Gattung* of the formulary piece, we have to take up the problem of its scope. The phrase δι' ὑμᾶς seems not to have composed part of the original fragment; rather the phrase appears to be a redactoral gloss added by our Petrine writer.[1] The character of δι' ὑμᾶς as a redactoral gloss is suggested by the following observations:

1. The phrase δι' ὑμᾶς lacks a counterpart in the first participial clause. Hence inclusion of this phrase seems to result in a distortion of the symmetrical structure of the neat *parallelismus*.

2. Inclusion of this phrase seems to impair an almost even syllabic structure.[2]

---

[1] The secondary redactoral character of δι' ὑμᾶς is also admitted by Bultmann ("Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 11). However, he appears not to exclude the possibility that the phrase might have been part of an original formulary piece; and if that were the case, the original form of ὑμᾶς could have been ἡμᾶς as Bultmann suggests (*ibid.*).

[2] Cf. Schattenmann, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus*, p. 3, fn. 1. Admittedly, an even syllabic structure is regarded by Schattenmann as one of the cardinal stylistic factors of *prose hymns*. One may be allowed (without much consideration as to whether the *Gattung* of a given formulary passage is properly 'hymn' or not) to take up this stylistic feature as a piece of supplementary evidence when examining a passage formed into a neatly constructed parallelism with an almost even syllabic structure.

3. The presence of the phrase seems to accord well with the present hortatory context in which vs. 20 is placed (cf. 1:13ff.).

b) Various answers have been given to the question: what is the proper Gattung of the formulary piece in 1:20? For instance, Windisch maintains that vs. 20 forms a two-part 'Christ-saying' (Christusspruch).[1] This view has recently been seconded by Schneider.[2] Neither of these men, however, elaborates Gattung-defining problems pertaining to his views. Beare thinks that what we have in this verse is a 'liturgical distich,' one "probably familiar to the readers, which is woven into the structure of the paragraph";[3] and he notes the similarity of vs. 20 to Eph. 1:3-12; 3:5, 9-11. But he, likewise, does not elaborate his definition. Bultmann conjectures that vs. 20 might originally have constituted an introductory part of a credal formula, which was composed of 1:20 and 3:18, 19, 22, with an opening statement such as πιστεύω εἰς or ὁμολογοῦμαι ἐν.[4] A view essentially the same as Bultmann's is held by Boismard, though with a few notable omissions.[1] Schelkle considers 1:18-21 as a whole to be one of the Christological confessions (Christusbekenntnisse).[2] Schelkle seems to be in accord with Bultmann and Boismard in affirming the credal character of vs. 20. A fatal flaw with Schelkle's view is that he does not examine (either from a literary or a context-analytical point of view) whether the passage, 1:18-21, can be treated as one homogeneous unit.

---

[1] Windisch-Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, p. 57.

[2] Schneider, Die Kirchenbriefe (1961), pp. 55-56.

[3] Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 80.

[4] Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbiref," p. 10.

The diversity of the views sampled above seems to be due to the fact that, first, there is no clear-cut Gattung-defining clue available in vs. 20 itself, and secondly, this verse appears to be too brief to claim a proper Gattung for itself. Our definition of the Gattung of vs. 20, therefore, appears to be largely dependent upon our asking, as Bultmann and Boismard do, whether vs. 20 may be regarded as part of a larger unit. In this case, while the Gattung of vs. 20 is to be in accord with that given to an alleged larger unit, a preliminary definition of the Gattung, which one ascribes to the alleged larger unit, comes to delimit the scope of the unit to be reconstructed or detected.

---

[1] Boismard, Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la premiere epitre de Pierre, pp. 60-67. Boismard omits πιστεύω . . . Χριστόν , ὅς ἔπαθεν . . . τῷ θεῷ and δ . . . ἐκήρυξεν from the credal formula as reconstructed by Bultmann. We shall presently return to the views held by Bultmann and Boismard.

[2] Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe . . ., p. 110. The remaining instances of Christological confessions are found in 2:21-25 and 3:18-22.

For instance, Bultmann begins his examination with an assumption that a passage composed of 3:18, 19, 22 is of a credal (bekenntnisartige) character, and at the same time, is of a fragmentary nature. In order to supplement this fragmentary piece, Bultmann adds vs. 20 as an introductory part to the passage. That assumption also requires Bultmann to conjecture that an appropriate Rahmenterminus (e.g., πιστεύω εἰς or ὁμολογουμαι ἐν) might have formed the opening statement of this alleged credal formula.

This line of approach followed by Bultmann is suggestive, but is not necessarily convincing on the following grounds:

First, it is not so certain as Bultmann assumes that a credal (or any other type of) formula is always represented in its entirety, though it may be in a dispersed manner, in any one of the N.T. writings. With regard to I Peter, one may maintain that the literary integrity of I Peter as an epistle does not warrant nor necessitate a complete representation of any of the formulary material.

Secondly, in an effort to present or reconstruct an alleged original form in its entirety, a certain degree of artificiality comes to be involved almost inevitably. In the case of Bultmann's reconstruction, the proposed addition of a Rahmenterminus and vs. 20 (as an introductory part) seems to be nothing but a conjecture, and from a stylistic point of view, the temporal antithetical parallelism does not seem to be in accord with 3:18, 19, 22.

In addition to these two factors, one may point out the possibility that vs. 20 by itself closely represents a succinct kerygmatic formula about the advent.[1]

In view of these objections, we shall refrain from assigning any proper Gattung to vs. 20. It seems to suffice to note the formulary character of this passage and, as regards the subject matter, its Christological content.

The outcome of our study in Section 1 may be outlined as follows:

1. In 1:20 a traditional Christological formula (or part of it) seems to be reflected.

2. The original text of this formulary piece may have been close to the following:

> (Χριστοῦ),
> προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ,
> φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων .

---

[1] The genitive case (i.e., προεγνωσμένου κτλ.) of vs. 20 seems to be due to the same case of Χριστοῦ in vs. 19. Cf. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 14. In his reconstruction of an alleged 'credal fragment,' Bultmann changes the genitive case of vs. 20 in an accusative case to agree with πιστεύω εἰς τὸν κύριον κτλ .

Cf. N. A. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt" in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 3-9.

3. No proper *Gattung* may be ascribed to this formulary piece.

SECTION 2

A History-of-Tradition Examination

In this section we shall examine the Christological formula represented in 1:20 primarily from a history-of-tradition point of view.

There are, on the one hand, a few literary-critical features which seem to mark this formula as unparalleled in the N.T. They are as follows: 1) the use of προγινώσκω, with Christ as its passive subject has no parallel elsewhere in the N.T.; 2) likewise, the combination of this verb with the phrase πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is also unparalleled in the N.T.; 3) there is no exact parallel in the rest of the N.T. to the succinctly formulated temporal antithetical parallelism represented in this formula. On the other hand, as we shall see presently, there are a number of terminological and conceptual parallels to the Christological formula concerned. Our examination will be carried out by taking the following steps: first, we shall try to elucidate the history-of-concept parallels to our Christological formula. Secondly, we shall examine the history-of-tradition relationships of the formula by means of a comparative analysis of possible N.T. parallels.

A. In this sub-section we shall be concerned with the history-of-concept parallels. To start with, let us take up the first participial clause, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and its parallels.

a) While the passive subject of προγινώσκω is Christ, the unexpressed active subject of this participle is presumably God. Where are we to look for possible parallels to the idea of God as the subject of foreknowledge?

The use of προγινώσκω in the sense of 'to know or perceive in advance,' based upon human foresight and prudence, is found in Classical Greek writers (Euripides, Hippolytus, 1072f. Thucydides II:64:6. Plato, Republic IV:426c).[1] In the Wisdom of Solomon 8:8, Wisdom is regarded as the subject of foreknowledge: "She foreseeth signs and wonders, and the issues of seasons and times."[2] 'Foreseeing' here seems to refer to a certain capacity for making predictions. The same capability is attainted in dreams in Philo, De Somniis I:2: "The second kind of dreams . . . seems to be possessed and God-inspired, and so capable of receiving some foretaste and foreknowledge of things to come."[3]

---

[1] Bultmann in TWNT, I, 715-716.

[2] Ibid. The Greek text of the passage reads: σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα προγινώσκει καὶ ἐκβάσεις καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων. E.t. by Holmes in Charles, APOT, I, 548.

[3] Ibid. The Greek text of a relevant portion of the passage reads: δεύτερον δ' εἶδος . . . ὡς ἱκανὸς εἶναι προλαμβάνειν καὶ προγινώσκειν τι τῶν μελλόντων. E.t.

The verb is also used as a medical term in the sense of 'to know before being told' or 'to declare unaided' (Hippocrates, Proginostikon I and Peri Aeron Hudaton Topon).[1] None of these instances may be regarded as an exact conceptual parallel to the verb in 1:20, since these parallels do not take God or deities as the active subject of these cognate terms.

It appears that the proper history-of-concept parallels are to be sought instead in the milieu of the O.T. and Jewish traditions of faith.[2] Admittedly, the use of προγινώσκω (Wis. Sol. 6:13; 8:8; 18:6) and πρόγνωσις (Judith 9:6; 11:19) in the related literature is infrequent and is limited to the Apocryphal writings; furthermore, πρόγνωσις in Judith 9:6 is the sole instance where the word denotes God's foreknowledge. These terminological considerations will not prevent us from seeking history-of-concept parallels in the Hebraic milieu, since, in the literature related to this milieu, one will find a number of instances of ידע , of which the active subject is God, and also cognate concepts such as the divine election and foreordination.

Now, in the O.T., there are many references to God's knowledge with regard to His providential help and

---

by F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker, Philo (London: W. Heinemann Ltd./New York: G.P. Putnum's Sons, 1934), Vol. V, p. 295.

[1] Liddell-Scott, p. 1473. [2] Bultmann in TWNT, I, 696.

care for His people and creatures (e.g., Ps. 1:6; 50:11; Nahum 1:7. Cf. Jer. 17:9-10). God's knowledge with this connotation is brought out clearly in an explicit confessional affirmation of His omniscience, e.g., in I Sam. 2:3; Ps. 139:1 and Isa. 28:29. When God's knowledge takes the Israelite people as a whole[1] or an individual[2] as its object, the idea of God's knowing seems to connote the sense of their election. In addition, God's knowledge is sometimes affirmed in connection with the course of historical events.[3]

Parallels to these O.T. instances are also found in the literature of Judaism.[4] A number of similar references are made in the DSS; especially noteworthy are the liturgical expressions in which God's knowledge with regard to creation and history is asserted.[5]

---

[1] E.g., Hosea 13:5; Amos 3:2. Cf. Isa. 43:1; 45:3-4; Hosea 5:3.

[2] E.g., Abraham in Gen. 18:19. The Second Isaiah himself in Isa. 49:1. Cf. Jer. 1:5.

[3] E.g., Isa. 5:19; 14:24-27; 19:17; Jer. 50:45; Micah 4:12. Cf. Judith 9:6.

[4] E.g., Judith 9:6; Assump. Moses 1:14; 12:4.

[5] Nötscher refers to the following instances: IQS III:15-16; IQH I:7-8, 14, 19-20. Cf. IQS XI:10-11, 17-18. IQH I:26-27; XII:10-11, etc. (F. Nötscher, Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-texte [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1956]), pp. 40-42. Cf. Wilckens in TWNT, VII, 504-505.

b) One notable feature in the first participial clause in 1:20 is the temporal phrase πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Most of the O.T. instances and those in the related literature enumerated above do not explicity express the temporal scheme as meant by πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, although it is not impossible to infer such a temporal implication from the instances which convey the idea of 'election' or 'foreordination.'[1] There are, however, a few notable parallels to the temporal scheme represented in the phrase πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου; these parallels may be classified into the three following types:

1. The first type is found in the Assumption of Moses 1:14; there Moses is designated as the one who is divinely foreordained. The text of this passage reads as follows:

> καὶ προεθεάσατό με ὁ θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναι με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην.
> (And He prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of His covenant.)[2]

2. The second type is found, e.g., in Prov. 8:22-23 and Sirach 24:9 where the hypostatized Wisdom is regarded as the object of God's foreordination. The texts of these two passages read as follows:

---

[1] Cf. e.g., Gen. 18:19; Ex. 33:12; Isa. 43:1; 45:3-4; 49:1; Jer. 1:5; Hosea 13:5; Amos 3:2.

[2] E.t. by Charles in Charles, APOT, II, 415. Charles quotes the Greek text as cited by Galasius of Cyzicum in his Comm. Aet. Syn. Nic. ii:18.

Proverb 8:22-23:-

יְהוָה קָנָנִי רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ
קֶדֶם מִפְּעָלָיו מֵאָז׃
מֵעוֹלָם נִסַּכְתִּי מֵרֹאשׁ מִקַּדְמֵי־אָרֶץ׃

κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ .
πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέν με ἐν ἀρχῇ .[1]

(The Lord created me at the beginning of his work,
the first of his acts of old.
Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the
beginning of the earth. RSV)

Sirach 24:9:-

πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέν με ,
καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπω .[2]

(He created me from the beginning before the world,
and I shall never fail.)

---

[1] In view of the fact that מֵעוֹלָם is rendered into Greek by πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος , we should not, perhaps, press too far the difference between ἀπό and πρό in the temporal phrases ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Matt. 13:35; 25:34; Lk. 11:50; Heb. 4:3; 9:26; Rev. 13:8) and πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (I Ptr. 1:20a; Jn. 17:24; Eph. 1:4).

[2] The adverbial phrase πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος (+ ἐπ᾽ ἀρχῆς in the Sirach passage) may be regarded as close to πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου , since it seems likely that, already in the pre-Christian period, the Genesis creation story was understood to mean that the beginning of time coincided with the creation of the world (cf. James Barr, Biblical Words for Time SBT; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1962 , p. 75). In other words, αἰών is not a spatial term as Cullmann conjectures (Oscar Cullmann, Christus und die Zeit, J.t. by Goroh Mayeda [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1954] , pp. 47-48), but is a Later-Judaistic temporal notion of which the beginning is thought to coincide with the creation.

3. The third type has to do with the pre-existence of the Son of man, or a Messianic figure.[1] Here IV Ezra 13:26 and I Enoch 48:2 seem noteworthy. The texts of these two passages read as follows:

IV Ezra 13:26:-

> (vs. 25: Whereas thou didst see a Man coming up from the heart of the Sea:)
> This is he whom the Most High is keeping many ages (*multis temporibus* = πόλλοις χρόνοις) and the same shall order the survivors.[2]

Box takes the phrase 'many ages' as a reference to the pre-existence of the heavenly Messiah (or, 'the Son of man' of I Enoch 37-70).[3] He also calls our attention to vs. 52, where the Messianic figure is hidden with God in a heavenly sphere.[4]

I Enoch 48:2:-

> And at that hour (i.e., when Enoch was looking at the vision of the fountain of righteousness) that Son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days.[5]

---

[1] One may note that Bultmann limits the history-of-concept parallels (to 1:20a) to Prov. 8:23; Sirach 24:9 and Assump. Moses 1:14; i.e., the notable parallels that we find in IV Ezra 13:26 and I Enoch 48:2 do not come into his consideration (Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im l. Petrusbrief," p. 11).

[2] E.t. by Box in Charles, *APOT*, II, 618.

[3] *Ibid.* (a footnote on 'many ages'). [4] *Ibid*.

[5] E.t. by Charles in Charles, *APOT*, II, 216.

The 'hour,' when the naming of the Son of man took place, seems to be elaborated in vss. 3 and 6:[1]

> vs. 3: Yea, before the sun and the signs were created, Before the stars of the heaven were made, His name was named before the Lord of Spirits.
>
> vs. 6: And for that reason (i.e., in relation to the eschatological hope ascribed to the Son of man) hath he been chosen and hidden before Him, before the creation of the world and for evermore.

Now, with regard to the parallels cited above, one may make the following observation: in the Assumption of Moses (1:14) and IV Ezra (13:26) as well as in I Enoch (48:2), the pre-existence of the objects of God's foreordination (Moses and the Son of man, respectively) appears to be presumed. Mowinckel maintains that the pre-existence of the Son of man (in I Enoch 48:2) is inconceivable; rather the naming of the Son before the creation is to be taken, so Mowinckel thinks, as synonymous with the Son's having been created prior to the creation of the world.[2] We do note against Mowinckel, however, that the creation of Moses and the Son of man prior to the creation of the world is not explicitly stated. The references in Prov. 8:22-23 and Sirach 24:9 are explicit: Wisdom is the object of God's creation.[1] Since the outlook represented in I Ptr. 1:20a is closer to the instances found in Assump. Moses 1:15; IV Ezra 13:26 and I Enoch 48:2, we may eliminate Prov. 8:22-23 and Sirach 24:9 from our consideration of the history-of-concept parallels to the Petrine passage.

---

[1] E.t. by Charles in Charles, APOT, II, 216.

[2] Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, E.t. by G. W. Anderson (New York/Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 372.

B. (a) Is it possible to define even more precisely the likely history-of-concept parallels to 1:20a? It seems that we can do so by bringing 1:20b into our consideration. The participial clause states that Christ was made manifest at the end of the times; that is, Christ's appearance is understood in an *endzeitliche* perspective of history.

---

[1] It is fair to mention that in the Wisdom of Solomon 9:9, the hypostatized Wisdom is described as having been with God at the creation. A problem related to this particular passage is that there are certain discrepancies among the references, in the Wisdom of Solomon, to the author(s) of the creation. In his edition of this writing Homes classifies these divergent references into three groups: 1) God as creator, 1:14; 6:7; 9:1, 9; 2) God as creator while Wisdom is present and exercised the prerogatives of choice, 8:4; 9:9; 3) Wisdom as creator, 7:22; 8:5, 6 (Charles, *APOT*, I, 528). Holmes regards the third group of references as representing the writer's own philosophical view. The second group of references, which concerns us at present, is considered by Holmes as representing the "means by which the writer endeavoured to reconcile the biblical with his philosophic view of creation." (*Ibid.*) The view propounded in 9:9 is unparalleled in the writings of the Wisdom literature.

Now, within the Assumption of Moses, Moses does not appear as the object of an endzeitliche expectation.[1]

In contrast to the Assumption of Moses, IV Ezra and I Enoch have parallels to the endzeitliche appearance of the Son of man, or a Messianic figure. The relevant passages may be quoted as follows:

IV Ezra 7:28:-[2]

> For my Son the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him, and shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years.

The temporal reference to this revelation is given in 7:26:[3]

> For behold the days come, and it shall be when the signs which I have foretold unto thee shall

---

[1] In Assump. Moses 9:1ff., we find a description of a mysterious figure Taxon, who appears to be a forerunner of a Messiah.

It has been maintained that the return of Moses as an endzeitliche forerunner of a Messianic figure was one of the notable features of faith among Samaritans during the intertestamental period (Paul Volz, Jűdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba [Tübingen/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1903], p. 191. A.F. von Gall, Basileia tou Theou [Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926], p. 380. A notable study is made by John Bowman, "Samaritan Studies," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXX [1957-58] , 298-327. See esp. pp. 302-304 on the pre-existent Moses).

The Rabbinic parallel to the idea of the return of Moses, with Elijah (cf. Mk. 9:4ff.) seems to be of a later date (Midrash Debrim Rabba on Moses--A.D. 900? Str.-Bill, IV, 785 and 789. Cf. Jeremias in TWNT, IV, 860-861).

[2] E.t. by Box in Charles, APOT, II, 582. [3] Ibid.

> come to pass. . . .

I Enoch 38:2:-[1]

> And when the Righteous One shall appear before the eyes of the righteous,
> Whose elect works hang upon the Lord of Spirits,
> And light shall appear to the righteous and the elect who dwell on the earth, . . .

In the context of this I Enoch passage, the appearing is meant to be a coming judgment of 'those who have denied the Lord of Spirits.' The 'Righteous One' is one of the titles conferred upon the Messianic figure.[2]

The *endzeitliche* perspective of history, with which the appearance of a Messianic figure is viewed in IV Ezra and I Enoch, seems to correspond with the perspective represented in I Ptr. 1:20b.

In view of this brief survey one may conclude that the history-of-concept parallel of 1:20 can be sought in the Messianic expectation as represented in IV Ezra (7:28; 13:26) and I Enoch (38:2; 48:2, 3, 6), while it seems probable, as a few linguistic features suggest, that the original formulation was available to our Petrine writer in Greek; or, the formulation might have taken shape in an Hellenistic milieu.[1] In other words, the two participial clauses in I Ptr. 1:20 appear to be an adoption and application of a conceptual framework of the speculation about the Son of man, an _endzeitliche_ figure, to Christ; the application may have originated in the kerygmatic intent of the early Church, that saw in Christ the very Messianic figure whose appearance had been awaited in certain circles, and viewed His coming as the consummation of the eschatological (*endzeitliche*) time.

---

[1] E.t. by Charles in Charles, *APOT*, II, 209.

[2] *Ibid.*

---

[1] The Hellenistic origin of the formulation concerned seems to be suggested by the phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων (cf. Jude 18) and by the term προγινώσκω which is of Hellenic-Hellenistic coinage (cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 1473). The phrase seems synonymous with ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, which is in turn an equivalent of באחרית הימים (cf. Gen. 49:1; Num. 24:14; Deut. 4:30; 31:29; Ps. 139:9; Isa. 2:2; Jer. 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39; Esek. 38:16; Dan. 10:14; Hosea 3:5; Micah 4:1. Χρόνος is used as an equivalent of יום, e.g., in Gen. 26:1, 15; Deut. 12:19; 22:19, 29; Joshua 4:14; 24; 24:31; Job 10:20; 29:18; 32:6, 7; Prov. 9:1; 15:15; 28:16; Isa. 23:15; 38:5; 65:20; Jer. 45 (38):28; Dan. 2:44). Cf. Michel, _Der Brief an die Hebräer_ (_KEK_, 10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 35.

Parallel phrases to ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων seem to be found in IV Ezra 8:50; 11:39; 12:9; 13:18, 20; 14:9 (cf. Box in Charles, _APOT_, II, _ad. loc_.). The phrases, 'in the last days' (13:18) and 'in the last time,' appear to be identical in sense in the contexts where they appear. Box takes these phrases as belonging to the redactor's remark (_ibid._, p. 617).

From the viewpoint of the analysis of traditional material, the use of χρόνος and ἡμέρα in I Peter seems worthy of note: ἡμέρα is retained whenever our Petrine writer appears to be drawing upon traditional O.T. idiomatic expressions or notions (2:12--Isa. 10:3; 3:10--Ps. 34:17, LXX; 3:20. Cf. Matt. 24:37-38. See Von Rad in _TWNT_, II, 945-949. Delling in _TWNT_, II, esp. 950-956), while χρόνος is used whenever he seems to reproduce faithfully the kerygmatic or parenetic material (which may have undergone Hellenistic influence). The latter kind of material may have been known well in the early Church (1:17; 4:2.3. Cf. Schelkle, _Die Petrusbriefe_ . . ., pp. 47-48. Schnackenburg, _Die sittliche Botschaft des N.Ts._ [München: Max Heuber Verlag, 1954], p. 251. Ehrhard Kamlan, _Die Form der Katalogischen Paranese im N.T._ [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1964], e.g., pp. 177-178. Wibbing, _Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im N.T._, p. 87). This observation of ours seems to agree with the fact that in I Ptr. 1:18-19 a Christological formula is reproduced, probably in terms close to the original formulation.

C. Let us now turn to a history-of-tradition examination of possible Christian parallels. As we have noted elsewhere,[1] there is no exact parallel to the temporal antithetical parallelism (of which the passive subject is Christ) as found in 1:20.[2] This simple fact helps us to narrow down considerably the range of possible parallels. In this sub-section C we shall take up I Ptr. 1:20a. We shall limit ourselves to the examination of the following notable passages, Acts 2:23; I Cor. 2:7 and Jn. 17:24.

a) The text of our first passage, Acts 2:23, reads as follows:

> τοῦτον (='Ιησοῦν) τῇ ὡρισμένῃ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκδοτον διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε, ...
>
> (this Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men, . . . RSV)

We examine this passage because of a notable use of πρόγνωσις , the only instance in the substantival form aside from I Ptr. 1:2.[1] In this verse the foreknowledge of God takes the events pertaining to the Passion of Christ as its object. Πρόγνωσις in this sense appears to correspond to the verb προορίζω in Acts 4:18, which reads ". . . to do whatever thy hand and thy plan had predestined to take place." The understanding represented in Acts 2:23, that the Passion took place according to the 'determined counsel and foreknowledge of God,' seems to have been part of the basic structure of the primitive Christian kerygma (see, e.g., Acts 4:27-28; 13:32-33; Rom. 1:1-4; I Cor. 15:3-4. Cf. Mk. 8:31; Lk. 22:22).[2]

---

[1] See p. 264.

[2] Cf. N. A. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt" in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), p. 5.

Now, as to a possible history-of-tradition relationship between Acts 2:23 and I Ptr. 1:20a, there are a few notable differences between these two passages: first, in the Acts passage, the events pertaining to the Passion of Christ are the immediate object of the divine foreknowledge, while in the Petrine passage Christ himself is the object. Secondly, the literary character of the immediate contexts of these two passages is different: Acts 2:23 is part of Peter's sermon delivered on the day of Pentecost; I Ptr. 1:20a is part of a temporal antithetical parallelism with formulary features. Thus it seems difficult to assume either a direct history-of-tradition relationship or a literary one between these two passages. Certain terminological and conceptual similarities[1] between the passages may be attributed to the fact that they share in the general frame of reference formulated by the primitive Church for an explication of the Christ-event.

---

[1] The phrase κατὰ πρόγνωσιν in I Ptr. 1:2 refers to ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς ; i.e., it denotes the foreordained status of Christians, and not Christ's being foreknown of God.

[2] See Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit (4th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1962), p. 141, fn. 2. Also pp. 141-144. Compare this with Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 152. Haenchen is in agreement with Dibelius in maintaining that the speech in Acts 2:14-41, for instance, originated in Luke's literary-theological ingenuity.

b) Now we come to I Cor. 2:7. The text of the verse reads as follows:

> ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ, τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν·
>
> (But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages for our glorification. RSV)

In this verse the assumed subject of λαλοῦμεν is Christian evangelists. This verb takes the 'wisdom of God' as its object. One may better understand ἐν μυστηρίῳ as an adjectival phrase to modify the preceding θεοῦ σοφίαν ,[1] rather than an adverbial phrase to modify λαλοῦμεν . A participial phrase τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην also seems to modify (θεοῦ) σοφίαν . In the given context, the relative clause in vs. 7 (i.e., ἣν προώρισεν κτλ.) appears to be in contrast to, and to be supplemented by, vs. 10a,[2] which runs as follows:

---

[1] For instance, the use of προγινώσκω -- πρόγνωσις, of which the active subject is God, and the designation of Christ or the events related to His Passion as the object of the divine foreknowledge may be listed among the similarities.

> (σοφίαν , vs. 7) . . . ἡμῖν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος .
>
> God has revealed (wisdom) to us through the Spirit (RSV).

If this contrast or supplementation is a justifiable one, as seems probable, then we have the following outline about the 'wisdom of God' in vss. 7 and 10 (with a few changes in word order):

> σοφίαν θεοῦ (ἐν μυστηρίῳ),
> ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ,
> ἣν ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος .

From a literary-critical point of view, this outline, which we find in I Cor. 2:7, 10, exhibits a remarkable similarity to I Ptr. 1:20 (i.e., God as the active subject of προορίζω and ἀποκαλύπτω ; an implied temporal parallelism;[1] closeness in meaning between προγινώσκω and προορίζω, φανερόω and ἀποκαλύπτω, respectively). A cardinal question with regard to the outline in I Cor. 2:7, 10 is the identity of the 'wisdom of God.' Scholars such as Schlier and Wilckens argue that what we have in the Corinthians passage is the σοφία-Christology.[2] Wilckens, for instance, bases his argument upon an alleged identity of the 'wisdom of God' with the 'Lord of glory' in I Cor. 2:8.[3] It is his view that in the Jewish apocalyptic thought, which he, Wilckens, regards as circumscribing I Cor. 2:7, denotes an eschatological Heilsgut, or the Torah;[4] and from this he concludes the identity of the 'wisdom of God' with the 'Lord of glory,' and explicitly rejects the view that takes the σοφία as the divine plan of salvation.

---

[1] So e.g., A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), p. 37. Lietzmann-Kümmel, *An die Korinther I/II*, p. 12. A. Wikenhauser, *Die Christusmystik des Apostel Paulus* (2nd ed.; Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1956), p. 148.

[2] Vs. 10a may be taken as part of an extended relative clause in vss. 8ff.; the antecedent of ἣν is σοφίαν (ἐν μυστηρίῳ) in vs. 7.

---

[1] If the phrase διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος (vs. 10a) is employed here as a counterpart to πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, as seems probable, the former phrase may be regarded (along with its counterpart) as reflecting the primitive Christian eschatological consciousness, which perceived the sign of the coming of eschatological time in the work of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 2:16ff. Joel 3:1-5).

[2] H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser (4th ed.; Düsseldorf:Patmos-Verlag, 1963), p. 162, fn. 1. Cf. pp. 159 ff. Wilckens in TWNT, VII, 519-520.

Schlier lists the following passages as relevant to an understanding of Paul's σοφία-Christology: I Cor. 1:21, 24, 30; 2:6ff.; II Cor. 4:4ff.; Rom. 10:6ff. Cf. Eph. 3:10 (Loc. cit.).

[3] On a pertinent critical remark about an alleged history-of-concept parallel to I Cor. 2:8, see W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge: The University Press, 1939), pp. 220-221.

[4] Wilckens in TWNT, VII, 520, fn. 382. Cf. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 147ff., and Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the N.T. (London: SCM Press, 1958), pp. 155ff.

Since the identity of the 'wisdom' has a significant bearing upon a history-of-tradition consideration of the outline detected above (2:7, 10a), this identity seems to require elucidation. It appears that just a context-analytical examination of vs. 7 will be sufficient for our purpose. The line of argument, which Paul pursues in 2:6ff., seems to be as follows: the subject matter of the early Christian (apostolic) proclamation as addressed to 'mature' Christians (cf. vs. 6) is the very 'wisdom of God in a mystery'; God foreordained this wisdom 'before the ages,' and revealed it to Christians; none of the rulers of this age knew such wisdom, and their ignorance of it led them to crucify the 'Lord of glory.' This plain logical sequence seems to suggest that Paul is trying to inquire into a hermeneutical basis for the Christian proclamation; that is, the 'wisdom of God' in the given context appears to be almost synonymous with the cognition of the history-of-salvation place of Jesus, or as Wikenhauser maintains, it is closely related to God's redemptive plan.[1] The reference to the Holy Spirit in vs. 10a, as a means of God's revelation of this wisdom to Christians, seems in accord with our observations. In short, the alleged identity of the 'wisdom' and the 'Lord of glory' can hardly be substantiated in the given context.[2]

That the alleged identity cannot be proved, means that the 'wisdom of God' in I Cor. 2:7 (and 10) cannot be taken as representing the so-called σοφία-Christology.[3] Thus it appears to be difficult to assume the existence of a direct history-of-tradition relationship between the Corinthians passage and I Ptr. 1:20, a Christological formula, despite notable parallels between them.

c) Now we come to the third passage, Jn. 17:24. What concerns us most is the ἵνα-clause in this verse. The text of it reads as follows:

---

[1] Wikenhauser, Die Christusmystik des Apostels Paulus, p. 148. Cf. N. A. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung" in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), p. 5.

[2] Against Robertson-Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, p. 38. Robertson and Plummer identify the 'wisdom' with the 'Christ crucified' by making a reference to I Cor. 1:18-24.

[3] Against Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, p. 162, fn. 1) and Wilckens in TWNT, VII, 519-520.

> . . . ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν , ἣν δέδωκάς μοι ὅτι ἠγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου . (. . . to behold my glory which thou hast given me in thy love for me before the foundation of the world. RSV)

This ἵνα-clause is part of the so-called High-Priestly prayer of Jesus. What is remarkable about this clause is that, first, Christ is designated as the object of God's personal relationship (cf. ἠγάπησας), and secondly, the temporal reference of this relationship is traced back to πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου . We are in agreement with Bultmann[1] in seeing a *sachliche* parallel, in the ἵνα -clause in Jn. 17:24, to the first participial clause in I Ptr. 1:20:-

> Jn. 17:24, (ὅτι) ἠγάπησάς με (=Christ) πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.
>
> I Ptr. 1:20a, (Χριστοῦ), προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου .

With regard to the Johannine passage, two more points seem worthy of note: first, this particular passage appears to be closely related to Jn. 17:5 so far as the temporal reference is concerned: "And now, Father, glorify Thou me in thy own presence with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made." (καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σύ , πάτερ , παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί); secondly, in the context of the prayer there is no counterpart of ἠγάπησάς με.

---

[1] Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 11. Bultmann also calls our attention to a striking parallel in the Odes of Solomon 45:15. On this parallel, see Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Vol. II, p. 623; also pp. 576-578.

Now, with regard to the first point, we do note that in Jn. 17:5 a close personal relationship between God and Christ is affirmed,[1] and the relationship is traced back to the time 'before the world came into being.' The basic similarities shared by Jn. 17:5, 24 and I Ptr. 1:20a appear to be more than accidental, despite certain terminological differences. With regard to the second point, we may observe that, elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel, the coming of Christ is delineated as an eschatological event which has brought the traditional O.T.-Jewish expectation to its fruition (see Jn. 1:45; 4:25-26; 5:39-40. Cf. Jn. 3:19; 6:32-33, 35).[2] In view of terminological differences and source-analytical problems, it seems difficult to regard these references to the coming of Christ as forming the original counterpart (from the viewpoint of 'analysis of traditional material') of the Christological scheme represented in Jn. 17:5, 24; nevertheless, there seems hardly any serious problem in our regarding those references to the coming of Christ and Jn. 17:5, 24 as belonging to the same conceptual milieu, which in turn was dependent upon a Jewish speculation that we have surveyed in the preceding sub-section (A).

---

[1] See παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον . . . παρὰ σοι .

[2] Bultmann, Theologie des N.Ts., pp. 389-392. On Jn. 1:45, e.g., see C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 310-312.

In view of terminological, context-analytical and form-critical differences, it appears to be difficult to assume the existence of a direct literary relationship between I Ptr. 1:20, on the one hand, and Jn. 17:5, 24 and the references to Christ's eschatological coming, on the other hand. However, the conspicuous similarities shared by Jn. 17:5, 24 and I Ptr. 1:20a seem to suggest rather strongly that there may be a certain history-of-tradition relationship between these parallel passages, or (though they are probably independent from each other) that both are dependent upon the same stratum of primitive Christian Christological schema, which took up the framework of the Jewish speculation about the Son of man and applied it to an explication of the Christ-event.[1]

The outcome of our study in this sub-section C may be summed up as follows:

---

[1] One may note that Hahn's Christologische Hoheitstitel (2nd ed., 1964), one of the most recent and certainly one of the well-informed discussions on N.T. Christology, does not have any reference to Jn. 17:5, 24 nor to I Ptr. 1:20 (on p. 215, Hahn takes up I Ptr. 1:18-21 as one of the units of Christological formulation. However, we have already noted the problems in regarding 1:18-21 as one homogeneous unit).

1. Among the notable parallels to Ptr. 1:20a, the most remarkable instance may be found in Jn. 17: (5 and) 24. While it seems difficult to assume the existence of a direct literary relationship between these two passages, there are basic similarities (that Christ is the object of God's personal relationship and that the temporal reference of this relationship is traced back to πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου). These are conspicuous enough to suggest that both passages are dependent upon a traditional Christological formulation which took over the temporal frame of reference of the Jewish speculation on the Son of man.

2. With regard to Acts 2:23 and I Cor. 2:7, terminological, context-analytical and conceptual differences seem to prevent us from assuming the existence of either a history-of-tradition relationship or a literary one between these two passages and I Ptr. 1:20a, --despite certain similarities.

D. Now, we turn to I Ptr. 1:20b and its parallels. Besides the instance in I Ptr. 1:20b, Christ as the passive subject of φανερόω is found also in I Tim. 3:16 and Heb. 9:26. In addition to these passages, φανερόω takes 'mystery' (Rom. 16:25-26; Col. 1:26. Cf. Eph. 3:9-10), 'grace' (II Tim. 1:9-10) or 'His word' (Tit. 1:2-3) as its passive subjects. Our examination will be limited to I Tim. 3:16; Heb. 9:26 and Tit. 1:2-3.

a) The text of I Tim. 3:16 reads as follows:

ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί ,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι ,
ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις ,
ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν ,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ ,
ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ .

(He was manifested in the flesh,
vindicated in the Spirit,
seen by angels,
preached among the nations,
believed on in the world,
taken up in glory. RSV)

That this passage forms a Christological (liturgical-) formulary piece, seems to be suggested by its contents and by the formulary features represented in it.[1]

---

[1] E.g., M. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," p. 222. J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (*NTD*, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 21-24; M. Dibelius- H. Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (*HNT*, 3rd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck --, 1955), pp. 49-50; M. -E. Boismard, *Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre*, pp. 60-61; E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*, esp. p. 55. Cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, p. 225, and Cullmann, *Die Christologie des N.Ts.*, p. 230.

Jeremias's view is interesting. In his opinion, the stylistic structure of I Tim. 3:16 closely resembles the hymn associated with the ancient Oriental ceremony of enthronement of a king (as to this type of hymn, Jeremias is dependent upon E. Norden); i.e., the threefold structure of the Timothy passage is regarded as corresponding to the structure of the enthronement hymn, (1) elevation (*Die Erhöhung*), (2) manifestation of the elevation (*Die Kundgebung der Erhöhung*), and (3) accession to the throne (*Die Thronbesteigung*). Jeremias

That which concerns us most in this passage is the fact that *Christ*, the implied antecedent of the relative pronoun ὅς, is said to have been 'manifested' (ἐφανερώθη) in the flesh. Syntactically and terminologically, therefore, this relative clause stands very close to I Ptr. 1:20b. Despite these similar features, however, there are also certain differences which seem to prevent us from assuming the existence of a direct literary relationship between the two passages concerned. One of the most conspicuous differences ensues from the fact that, while the Petrine passage, 1:20b is part of a temporal antithetical parallelism, the Timothy passage is part of a formulary piece made into a chiastic structure,[1] not based on an explicit temporal sequence:[2] Christ's being manifested in the Timothy passage does not have an explicit temporal reference, like ἐπ' ἐσχάτου

---

thinks that the same structure is also represented in Phil. 2:9-11; Matt. 28:18-20 and Heb. 1:5-14.

[1] Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Die Breife an Timotheus und Titus*, p. 22. He sees the (double) chiastic structure as follows:

the earthly (ἐν σαρκί) — the heavenly (ἐν πνεύματι)
the heavenly (ἀγγέλοις) — the earthly (ἐν ἔθνεσιν)
the earthly (ἐν κόσμῳ) — the heavenly (ἐν δόξῃ)

The last dative phrase may be a reference to the heavenly כבוד (cf. Spicq, *Les Epîtres pastorales*, pp. 106-111).

[2] See Dibelius's remark, "Der Inhalt des Stückes in seiner jetzigen Form ist nicht als chronologische Aufzählung von 'Heilstatsachen' anzusehen." (Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, p. 50).

τῶν χρόνων such as we find in I Ptr. 1:20b; then too, a parallelism is found in the Timothy passage, where ἐν σαρκί is opposed to ἐν πνεύματι. Furthermore, in the context of the Timothy passage, there is no explicit reference to Christ's being foreknown of God (nor to the phrase, 'before the foundation of the world').

In Section A we observed that the temporal references as represented in I Ptr. 1:20 would seem to have conspicuous history-of-concept parallels, and we suggested that those references might have originated with the primitive Christian explication of the Christ-event, in applying to it the framework of the Jewish speculation about the Son of man. If this line of consideration about the temporal references is important to our history-of-tradition assessment of I Ptr. 1:20, as seems probable, then the conspicuous absence of any temporal references from the Timothy passage may be taken to suggest that there is no direct history-of-tradition relationship between the two passages under review, and that the history-of-tradition background of the Timothy passage is to be sought elsewhere.[1]

---

[1] In I Tim. 3:16 Spicq sees an accent placed on the 'manifestation of Christ on the earth as in the heavens,' and the passage is formulated, so Spicq thinks, with the intention of contrasting the Christian cult with that of Artemis (Les Épîtres pastorales, pp. 106-109).

b) A notable parallel to I Ptr. 1:20b is found in Heb. 9:26b. The text reads as follows:

> νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται .
> (But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. RSV)

This passage is concerned with Christ's once-for-all self-sacrifice for a redemptive purpose. The use of an emphatic adverb ἅπαξ in contrast to the repetition of the sacrificial offering in the old dispensation is notable.[1] That which concerns us most, however, is that a temporal phrase ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων is employed, together with another emphatic expression νυνὶ δέ ,[2] to denote the time of the appearance of Christ. Now, the phrase ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων forms, as an equivalent of בְּסוֹף הַיָּמִים , an "eschatological counterpart" of the phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in vs. 26a.[3] Admittedly, the latter phrase (i.e., ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in vs. 26a) does not correspond, in its given context, to I Ptr. 1:20a, since this phrase is a temporal reference to the imaginative repeated sufferings of Christ, and does not serve as a reference to the time of Christ's being known of God; furthermore, there is no explicit remark about Christ's being known of God in the immediate context of the Hebrews passage (Heb. 9:23-28). Despite these notable differences, the appearance of these two temporal antithetical references in Heb. 9:26 seems to suggest that, first, the temporal frame of reference of the Hebrews passage was in touch with the Jewish apocalyptic scheme of history which we surveyed in Section A, and secondly, some sort of history-of-tradition relationship may be presumed to exist between this Hebrews passage and I Ptr. 1:20, since both are concerned (at least in part) with denoting Christ's _endzeitliche_ appearance.

---

[1] Ἅπαξ (Heb. 6:4; 9:7, 26, 27, 28; 10:2; 12:26, 27) and ἐφάπαξ (Heb. 10:10) seem to be significant terms in the explication of the Christ-event in Hebrews. See also the use of ἅπαξ in Rom. 6:10 and I Ptr. 3:18. In the latter passage Michel sees breaking through a 'fixed kerygmatic tradition' (feste kerygmatische Tradition). Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, p. 215.

[2] The emphatic expression νυνὶ δέ is paralleled elsewhere in the N.T. in association with the appearance of 'mystery' (δὲ νῦν , Rom. 16:26; νῦν δέ , Col. 1:26) or of 'grace' (δὲ νῦν , II Tim. 1:10). Dibelius sees in these parallels a presentation of epiphany-Christology (Dibelius-Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 49). See also I Cor. 15:20.

[3] Michel, loc. cit. Cf. C. Spicq, L'Épître aux Hebreux (2nd ed.; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1953),

Now, between these two passages (i.e., I Ptr. 1:20 and Heb. 9:26) there are obvious differences which seem to prevent us from assuming the existence of a direct literary relationship: first, as we have just noted above, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in Heb. 9:26a does not correspond to the context of I Ptr. 1:20a; secondly, the

---

Vol. II, p. 269. Also B. F. Westcott, _The Epistle to the Hebrews_ (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eedmans Publishing Co., 1951, photolithoprinted reissue), pp. 274-275.

phrase ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων is a *hapax-legomenon* in the N.T. as well as the LXX;[1] one may also argue that this phrase does not coincide precisely with ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων in I Ptr. 1:20b.[2] Therefore, unless these differences are elucidated by a cogent exegetical argument to be the outcome of the literary adaptation by one of the other, it seems hardly possible to assume a direct literary relationship between these passages.

While we make this reservation, the correspondence between I Ptr. 1:20b and Heb. 9:26b, as exhibited in the combination of the appearance of Christ and the *endzeitliche* reference, seems too close to be accidental, and suggests a common history-of-tradition background behind the passages concerned, or their dependence upon similar Christological formulations based upon the same temporal outlook.

c) We now come to the third passage, Tit. 1:2-3. The text of this passage reads as follows:

> ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου,
> ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων,
> ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίοις τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν

---

[1] Cf. συντελεία καιρῶν, Dan. 9:7; συντέλεια ἡμερῶν, Dan. 12:13; καιρὸς συντελείας, Dan.12:4. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 225. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, p. 215.

[2] See Westcott, *loc. cit.* Wescott there compares ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων with the phrase ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τουτῶν in Heb. 1:2. He thinks that the latter phrase refers to "the last period of the present age," while the former refers to "a point of termination of a series of preparatory ages."

> κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ.
>
> (In hope of eternal life which God, who never lies, promised ages ago and at the proper time manifested in his word through the preaching with which I have been entrusted by command of God our Saviour. RSV)

This passage forms part of a rather extended *Superscriptio*. So far as the temporal references in this Titus passage are concerned, there seems to be a remarkable similarity between this passage and I Ptr. 1:20: first, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων is close to πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, though it does not so explicitly allude to the creation as a point of temporal reference.[1] Secondly, the same verb φανερόω is used in both passages. Thirdly, a notable antithetical particle δέ is used in both passages, while μέν is omitted in Tit. 1:2. Fourthly, if one may assume that there is a temporal antithetical parallelism in the Titus passage, as seems probable, then the phrase καιροῖς ἰδίοις may be regarded as a counterpart of πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων,[2] and as a parallel to ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων (I Ptr. 1:20b), even though καιροῖς ἰδίοις lacks an explicit *endzeitliche* reference.

---

[1] Jeremias takes πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων to mean the *'vorweltliche Ewigkeit'* (Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, pp. 59-60). Spicq, however, thinks that this phrase "simply signifies the indefinite time, or a great antiquity" (*Les Épîtres pastorales*, p. 221). Cf. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, p. 227.

[2] Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 228. Kelly thinks that the phrase *'at his own good time'* "draws a deliberate contrast with *from all eternity*" (The italized words correspond *to Kelly's translation*), and he refers to I Tim. 2:6; 6:15.

At the same time, however, differences between these two passages are obvious; one of the most conspicuous differences is that, while Christ is the passive subject of φανερωθέντος (as well as of προεγνωσμένου), the 'hope of eternal life' and 'his word' are the objects of God's promise and manifestation, respectively, in Tit. 1:2-3.[1] That the 'hope' is not identical with Christ, appears to be clear enough from its given context. 'His word,' the object of God's manifestation, need not reflect the Logos-Christology; this remark of ours seems to be supported by the following phrase ἐν κηρύγματι κτλ.[2] In the given context, 'his word' appears to be close to God's redemptive purpose, or the Gospel;[3] the phrase may be regarded as synonymous with the σοφία in I Cor. 2:7 or with the μυστήριον in Rom. 16:26; Col. 1:26.

---

[1] From a syntactical point of view, we have an instance of 'ἀνακόλουθον after a relative clause' in Tit. 1:2-3. Blass-Debrunner, 469 (p. 298). This feature is also noted by Spicq, *Les Épîtres pastorales*, p. 222.

In rhetoric, ἀνακολουθία means "inconsequence, especially employed with humorous effect"; as a grammatical feature it denotes an anomaly of inflexions (Liddell-Scott, p. 109). From a syntactical point of view, this term refers to a certain inconsistency as exhibited in Tit. 1:2-3; in this passage the relative clause ἣν κτλ. refers, as a matter of course, to its antecedent ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου , while ἐφανέρωσεν takes τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ as its object, and not ἐλπίδι .

[2] Walter Lock, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), pp. 155-156.

[3] So Spicq, *loc. cit.*

In addition to this conspicuous difference, there are also terminological, context-analytical and form-critical discrepancies between the two passages in question.

In view of these differences, one may conclude that it seems hardly possible to assume a direct history-of-tradition relationship or a literary one between Tit. 1:2-3 and I Ptr. 1:20b. Certain similarities may be attributed to the fact that both passages are dependent upon a traditional Jewish temporal framework for their different lines of Christological or kerygmatic formulations.

The outcome of this sub-section D may be summed up as follows:

1. Among the parallels to I Ptr. 1:20b, the most remarkable instance may be found in Heb. 9:26b (cf. vs. 26a). While it appears to be difficult to assume the existence of a direct literary relationship between these two passages in view of terminological and context-analytical differences, the combination of the appearance of Christ and the endzeitliche reference in vs. 26b (as well as the use of the phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in vs. 26a) seems to suggest that the Hebrews passage was in touch with the Jewish temporal scheme, which also underlies the Petrine passage, and that a

history-of-tradition relationship may be presumed in terms of their dependence upon similar Christological formulations based on that temporal outlook.

2. With regard to I Tim. 3:16 and Tit. 1:2-3, terminological, context-analytical and conceptual differences seem to restrain us from assuming the existence of a history-of-tradition relationship or a literary one, between these passages and I Ptr. 1:20b, despite certain similarities.

CHAPTER VII

A CHRISTOLOGICAL CREDAL PIECE IN 3:18-22

In this passage a traditional Christological hymnic piece appears to be represented. The text of this passage reads as follows:

ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν ,[1]
δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων , ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ

---

[1] We shall limit ourselves to inquiring into one of the difficult text-critical problems in this passage, namely, the reading of ἀπέθανεν .

It seems difficult to make a clear-cut choice between the two readings, ἀπέθανεν (ℵ ACD 5 7 11 13 27 29 68 69 73 137 1^{lect} a^{scr} k^{scr} vg syr^{utr} cop arm aeth Did$^{tri\ 2,6,6}$ et^{2,7,2} Cyr$^{act\ 57}$ Sev$^{cat\ 71}$ Thphyl^{txt} Cyp^{296} Aug^{ep165}) and ἔπαθεν (BKLP Aug$^{pecc\ mer}$ Thphyl^{com} Oec) (Textual references based on Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* 8th ed.; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872), Vol. II, p. 290). Our preference for ἀπέθανεν instead of ἔπαθεν is dependent upon three considerations, i.e., textual, context-analytical and form-critical. A close parallel in 2:21 is also to be taken into account.

So far as we can see, textual evidence for either one of these two readings is not conclusive; however, we can now appeal in addition to the Bodmer Papyri VIII (p. 72, 3rd century) and to the Old Latin version (*Vetus Latina*. no. 26. 2nd part, ed. by the Beuron editors, 1957) in support of our preference, ἀπέθανεν .

From a context-analytical point of view, ἀπέθανεν seems to be out of place; this is a strong point against the reading (see, e.g., Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, p. 141). The weight of this consideration appears to be reduced, however, by two observations: first, ἀπέθανεν is certainly a *lectio difficilior* precisely in this given context. Secondly, as we shall see presently, vss. 18, 19 and 22 appear to reflect a

θεῷ , θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι · ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν , (ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε ὅτι ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος. ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σῴζει βάπτισμα, οὐ, σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν , δι' ἀναστάσεως 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ,)[1] ὅς ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ , πορευθεὶς

---

traditional Christological hymnic piece, and in this regard, ἀπέθανεν is different from ἔπαθεν in 2:21, which belongs to our Petrine writer's own comment in introducing the theme of the *imitatio Christi*, which in turn is moulded upon the motif of the Suffering Servant. In keeping with this is the fact that ἀπέθανεν is used in the passage which is tied up with the theme of the death of Christ (i.e., the death, the descent into Hades and the ascension in 3:18, 19, 22). Schelkle maintains that ἔπαθεν is a legitimate reading, since *passus* signifies "das ganze Todesleiden" (*Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., p. 102, fn. 2). This view is not very convincing. Schelkle is certainly right with regard to the cases in which *passus* is used as a comprehensive term for the Passion (e.g., Matt. 17:12; Lk. 22:15; 24:26, 46; Acts 1:3; Heb. 2:18; 5:8; 9:26; 13:12). However, when it is used in relation to the sequence of events pertaining to the Passion (and the resurrection) of Christ, the meaning of *passus* is limited to signify the maltreatment and derision of Christ prior to His death, and is followed by ἀποκτείνω (e.g., Mk. 8:31; Matt. 16:21; Lk. 9:22. Cf. Phil. 2:6-11. Also Eph. 4:9; Rom. 1:3-4; Acts 3:13-16; 4:10).

Cf. Sakae Kubo, *p^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965), pp. 39-41.

[1] We shall comment on the parenethesized passage (vss. 20-21) presently.

> εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.
>
> For Christ also died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit; in which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, (who formerly did not obey, when God's patience waited in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were saved through water. Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a clear conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ,) who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, with angels, authorities, and powers subject to him (RSV).

Before we go into the examination of 3:18-22 as a whole, the following remark may be made about vss. 20-21, the parenthesized passage. It seems likely that these two verses did not belong to the original Christological formula which we shall detect and define presently; rather vss. 20-21 appear to be an explanatory and homiletic insertion into the present context made by our Petrine writer. This remark of ours is suggested by our general observation that, if vss. 20-21 are set aside, the remaining verses (i.e., vss. 18, 19, 22) seem to compose a thematic unit with a few redactoral additions; i.e., vss. 18, 19, and 22 states the facts of the Passion of Christ and the events subsequent to it in a descriptive manner. The extended participial clause in vs. 20 modifies πνεύμασιν .[1] The extended relative clause in vs. 21 refers to the preceding ὕδατος ; βάπτισμα stands in apposition to the relative pronoun ὅ ; the secondary character of this relative clause is especially apparent in the present tense of σῴζει , which takes ὑμᾶς as its object. We do admit that vss. 20-21 present interesting history-of-concept and history-of-tradition problems. In this chapter of our study, however, we shall limit ourselves to the examination of vss. 18, 19, 22.[2]

SECTION 1

A Preliminary Observation

In this section we shall be concerned with detecting and defining a traditional Christological formula in 3:18-22. There are two questions to be taken up:

1. What are the features to suggest reflection or presence of a 'traditional formulary' piece in this

---

[1] On a syntactical feature represented in this participial clause, see Nigel Turner, A Grammar of N.T. Greek (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), Vol. III, p. 153.

[2] The secondary character of vss. 20-21 seems to be also assumed, e.g., by Bultmann ("Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," pp. 1-14), though without any elaborate explanation.

passage?

2. If the reflection or presence of such a piece may be confirmed, what is its Gattung?

A. Let us take up the first question. There are two aspects to the answer of this question: first, linguistic and context-analytical features which seem to suggest a distinction of this passage from the rest of I Peter, and secondly, 'formulary' features which seem to meet the criteria which we have set up.

From a linguistic point of view, the following features appear to be worthy of note:

1. ἅπαξ is a hapax-legomenon in I Peter. Its use especially in association with the Passion is explicitly paralleled only in Heb. 9:28.[1]

2. The phrase περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν is a hapax-legomenon in I Peter. The use of the plural form of ἁμαρτία is paralleled, in I Peter, only in 2:24, which may echo the terminology of Isa. 53:12 (LXX) in connection with an explication of the vicarious significance of the Passion.[2] The use of περί to emphasize the vicarious significance of the death of Christ is paralleled in

---

[1] Cf. Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, pp. 216-217. Michel comments on Heb. 9:27-28 as follows: "V. 27-28 arbeitet mit älterem katechetischen Material und will in diesem Zusammenhang wohl die Einzigartigkeit und Einmaligkeit des Opfers Christi beschreiben." (Ibid., p. 217.)

[2] See e.g., Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe . . ., pp. 84-86.

Matt. 26:28; I Thess. 5:10; Rom. 8:3; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10.[1]

3. Ἀποθνῄσκω, which signifies the death of Christ in 3:18, is a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter.

4. The expression that takes Christ as the subject of προσάγω, and takes 'you' (Christians) and 'to God' as direct object and indirect object, respectively, is found only in 3:18 in the N.T.

5. Κηρύσσω is a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter. The statement that Christ preached to the 'spirits in prison' (3:19) is not explicitly paralleled elsewhere in the N.T.

6. The relative clause ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ is literally and conceptually a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter.

7. The reference to the ascension of Christ is a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter.

8. Ἄγγελοι as a group of cosmic powers to be subjugated to Christ is a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter (cf. 1:12).

9. Ἐξουσιῶν is a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter.

10. The plural form of δύναμις to denote another group of cosmic powers to be subjugated to Christ is a *hapax-legomenon* in I Peter (cf. 1:5 and a variant reading of 4:14).

---

[1] With Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu*, pp. 132-133.

From a context-analytical point of view, an aporia seems to be represented by vss. 18-22. We shall begin with a general observation. The passage, 3:13-22, follows after a series of rules, which by themselves compose one unit, or a Haustafel (2:11-3:12); a quotation of Ps. 33:13-17a (LXX) provides a scriptural illustration for the preceding line of statements and thus concludes the section. Verse 3:13-22 appears to be closely related to the preceding section: i.e., 3:13 takes up the two motifs in 3:11-12 (ὁ κακώσων -- ποιοῦντας κακά, vs. 12; τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταί -- ποιησάτο ἀγαθόν, vs. 11), and develops them as relevant for the readers' situation, or a critical condition created by impending trials and sufferings. Within the passage, 3:13-22, however, vss. 18-22 are distinguished from the immediately preceding verses, since vs. 18 brings up the theme of the death of Christ as an illustration (note the use of ὅτι καί) for the preceding hortatory context which is primarily concerned with the suffering of Christians for doing good things (see vs. 17); the passage, introduced by a reference to the death of Christ, consists primarily[1] of descriptive statements of the death, the descent into Hades and the ascension of Christ. The descriptive manner and the content of vss. 18-22 can hardly be regarded as an integral part of the hortatory context of the preceding passage, vss. 13-17. We do note that 4:1 takes up the motif set out in 3:18 (i.e., Christ's suffering in the flesh); while this fact suggests that vss. 18-22 serve as a "single unit, essential to the author's line of thought,"[1] the same fact does not do away with a conspicuous context-analytical aporia which exists between vss. 13-17 and vss. 18-22.

---

[1] As we noted at the outset, vss. 20-21 are excluded from our immediate concern.

The two observations we have made above seem to lead us to see 3:18-22 as a distinct unit in I Peter. This remark is now to be related to the following observation of the 'formulary' character of the passage being studied. In vss. 18, 19 and 22, there seem to be a few fragmentary formulary clauses and phrases which appear to have been inserted by the Petrine writer into the context of a Christological formula. 'Formulary' features will be noted with regard to the main body of the formula and also in relation to those fragmentary pieces.

1. The substantival use of anarthrous adjectives in the phrase δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων seems to suggest that, in connection with the soteriological explication of the Passion, this phrase may have become a customary

---

[1] We owe this phrase to Dr. J. Louis Martyn's remark on an exegesis paper I submitted to him.

idiomatic expression.[1]

2. The antithetical *parallelismus membrorum*, composed of two participial clauses with an almost even syllabic structure (θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι), appears to be remarkably 'formulary.'[2]

3. The use of participles (besides θανατωθείς and ζωοποιηθείς , πορεύθεις in vss. 19 and 22) is notable.

4. The use of the relative pronoun ὅς , the antecedent of which is Jesus Christ, adds to the 'formulary' character.

5. "A normative manner in referring to the elementary truths and facts of the *Heilsgeschichte*," in Stauffer's terms, seems to be represented in these verses.

6. As we shall see in the next section, there are parallels to the details of this passage in the N.T.

7. If our attempt to identify redactoral insertions (as we shall present it shortly) is justifiable, the remainder of vss. 18, 19 and 22 may be divided into somewhat 'meaningfully divided clauses.'

Now we shall inquire into possible redactoral insertions and alterations made by our Petrine writer.

---

[1] The anarthrous use of adjectives may be regarded an instance which is explicable from the 'modification of Apollonius' canon' (see Moule, *An Idiom Book of N.T. Greek*, p. 115).

[2] An instance of *homoioteleuton* is represented in σαρκί -- πνεύματι . Note also the use of antithetical particles, μέν and δέ .

The following remarks may be made:

1. It appears to be quite likely that the phrase δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων is a redactoral insertion.[1] This phrase serves as an epexegetical comment on the preceding sentence, which by itself, together with the ἵνα-clause (which follows δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων), seems to make clear and perfect sense without this phrase.

2. The antithetical parallelismus membrorum also seems to be a redactoral insertion[2] on the following grounds: the parallelism does not harmonize with the rest of vss. 18, 19 and 22; the participle θανατωθείς is apparently redundant, since it is preceded by ἀπέθανεν ; furthermore, if vss. 18, 19 and 22 as a whole may be regarded as concerned with a presentation of the Passion and events subsequent to it primarily in

---

[1] So Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 3. Also Boismard, Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la première épître de Pierre, pp. 65-66.

[2] Against Bultmann, who retains this parallelismus membrorum (op. cit., pp. 2, 4 and 14). Boismard follows Bultmann in retaining this (loc. cit.).

Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern," ZNW, XXXX (1949), 194-201. The hymn reconstructed by Jeremias is as follows:

θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί ,
ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι ,
ὃς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ ,
πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν .

A major drawback to Jeremias's reconstruction is that he does not present any pertinent explanation as to why he excludes vs. 18 and the reference to the preaching to the 'spirits' from his reconstructed hymn.

a chronological manner, as seems probable, the participial clause ζωοποιηθεὶς ἐν πνεύματι, obviously a reference to the resurrection,[1] is out of sequence, since it is followed by a remark about the descent into Hades.[2]

3. Ὅτι καί is a phrase to introduce the Christological formulary piece, and it alludes to the exemplary character of the Passion of Christ; it appears to be likely that this phrase did not belong to the formulary piece originally.

4. The original form of ὑμᾶς may have been ἡμᾶς, if the 'liturgical' character of this piece may be assumed. The use of ὑμᾶς seems explicable from its present hortatory context.

---

[1] So Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe* . . ., p. 104.

[2] We have already noted the 'formulary' character of this *parallelismus membrorum* as well as that of δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων. These clauses and phrase are at least partially paralleled elsewhere in the N.T. (on the *parallelismus memborum*, see Rom. 1:3 and I Tim. 3:16. Cf. Matt. 26:41. On the phrase, see Acts 3:14; II Cor. 5:21. Cf. Matt. 27:19; Lk. 23:47; Rom. 3:25). Thus we do note that these clauses and phrase represent 'traditional formulary' fragments. This fact does not necessarily mean, however, that they were originally integral parts of the Christological formulary piece which we find in I Ptr. 3:18, 19 and 22.

On Acts 3:14 and its possible dependence upon the primitive Christian kerygma, see Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 170 and 174. On II Cor. 5:21, see Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (*KEK*, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), pp. 196-199. The language of Isa. 53 may be reflected in this Corinthian passage (Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*, pp. 96-97).

On Rom. 1:3, see Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, pp. 30-31. Michel there discusses the probable reflection of a pre-Pauline formula of confession in Rom. 1:3-4. Cf. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, pp. 24-28.

5. The phrase ἐν ᾧ may be eliminated, since as a 'vague resumptive phrase,' this phrase appears to be out of place in this succinctly formulated piece; from a syntactical point of view, the antecedent of the relative pronoun ᾧ is hardly πνεύματι or θεῷ in vs. 18, since we especially note the secondary character of the parallelismus membrorum.

6. A definite article τοῦ may be inserted between δεξιᾷ and θεοῦ, since when ἐν δεξιᾷ and θεοῦ appear together elsewhere (Acts 2:33; Rom. 8:34; Col. 3:1; Heb. 10:12. Cf. Acts 7:55),[1] θεοῦ usually takes the article. An inclusion of this article also seems to help to restore an almost even syllabic structure, as we shall see presently.

7. πορευθείς in vs. 19 may not have belonged to the original piece.[2] This word appears to be inserted into the present context as an epexegetical term.

8. The phrase ἄγγελοι καί seems secondary. Its inclusion in the present context is explicable on the assumption that the Petrine writer relates the story of the flood (vss. 20-21) to the speculation about fallen angels.

---

[1] Cf. Acts 5:31; Eph. 1:20 (ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ); Heb. 8:1 (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης); Heb. 12:2 (ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θεοῦ); Rev. 5:1 (ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. See Rev. 1:7). Cf. Kubo, P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus, pp. 41-42.

[2] With Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," p. 5.

When we bring these remarks together, we have the following as the reconstructed Christological formulary piece:

Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν
ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ ,
καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν .

Ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ,
περευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν ,
ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων .

B. What is the *Gattung* of this Christological formulary piece?[1]

It is clear that no first-hand *Gattung*-defining criteria such as a *Rahmenterminus* is available in the reconstructed piece itself. Our definition will be dependent primarily upon our evaluation of the contents and formulary features represented here.

---

[1] We have already noted elsewhere that two different *Gattungen* were ascribed to the passage concerned: i.e., the credal-formulary character of this passage has been maintained, e.g., by Lietzmann ("Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses," pp. 174-175; he calls this passage a '*liturgische Bekenntnis*'), Bultmann ("Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief," *passim*), Cullmann (*Les première confessions de la foi Chretienne*, pp. 14-15), and Leconte (*Les Épîtres catholiques*, p. 110).

The view that regards this passage as a hymnic piece has been held by such scholars as Windisch-Preisker, *Die katholische Briefe*, p. 70) and Boismard (*Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la Première Épître de Pierre*, esp. pp. 57-67).

Stylistic features in favour of its hymnic character are as follows: first, an almost even syllabic structure;[1] secondly, clearly defined strophes; thirdly, a certain thematic correspondence between this Christological formulary piece and a Christological hymn represented in Phil. 2:6-11 (i.e., the contrast between the descent or humiliation of Christ and His ascension or glorification).[2]

Now, the features not in favour of the hymnic character may be enumerated as follows: first, terms that explicitly denote praise or thanksgiving are absent from this formulary piece. Secondly, the passage is primarily concerned with telling of the Passion of Christ (with a brief clause to signify the redemptive significance of the Passion) and of the events subsequent to it, and not primarily with explicating the significance of the Christ-event from the viewpoint of 'self-understanding in faith' on the part of Christians. Thirdly, the 'even syllabic structure,' which is regarded by Schattenmann as one of the cardinal stylistic features of prose hymns, may be taken up (as we did in connection with our discussion on I Ptr. 1:20) as applicable to liturgical-formulary pieces (i.e., not exclusively to prose hymns). The same thing may be said about the 'clearly defined strophes.' Fourthly, the *thematic* correspondence exhibited between our Petrine passage and Phil. 2:6-11 does not have a direct bearing upon the definition of the *Gattung* of the Petrine passage. Thus, although we do note the liturgical-formulary character of our passage, it appears to be far from certain that this passage is a hymnic piece.

---

[1] See Schattenmann, Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus, p. 3, fn. 1.

[2] Cf. I Tim. 3:16.

It seems likely that the Petrine passage is a piece of Christological *credal* formulation. While no *Rahmenterminus* is available to indicate its credal-formulary character, the strophic division and the almost even syllabic structure are not against the 'credal-formulary' nature of this passage. Especially its descriptive manner of presentation of the basic facts of the Christ-event seems to be in favour of this *Gattung*. One problem with our assuming its credal character, however, is that, despite a roughly chronological presentation of events, no explicit reference is made to the resurrection. This absence of any explicit reference is not against the credal character, if it is assumed that the main theme, which this formulary piece intends to propound, is a contrast between the descent and the ascension of Christ; if this is the case, the kind of formulation that we have in vss. 18, 19 and 22 may be regarded as pointing to the variety of Christological credal formulations. The absence of any reference to the resurrection in the formulary piece seems to have been noted also by the Petrine writer; his inclusion of the phrase δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in vs. 21 may have been partly due to his intention to fill out the chronological sequence in this formulary passage, since it seems that this phrase represents a context-analytical aporia in vss. 20-21.

The outcome of our study in Section 1 may be summed up as follows:

1. In I Ptr. 3:18, 19 and 22 it seems that we have a piece of traditional Christological formulation.
2. If our identification of redactoral insertions and alterations is justifiable, we can reconstruct an original formula, composed of two strophes, on the motif of the descent (-humiliation) and the ascension (-glorification) of Christ.
3. The Gattung of this formula seems to be credal.

SECTION 2

A History-of-Tradition Examination

In this section we shall be concerned with the history-of-tradition problems represented in the reconstructed Christological credal formula.

A. To start with, we shall take up the first half of the Christological formula. In the reconstructed credal piece as we presented above, this passage is divided into three lines. Now, as we have noted in the preceding section, 1) the reference to Christ's preaching to the 'spirits in prison' is not explicitly paralleled elsewhere in the N.T. In addition, 2) the explicit combination of a reference to the death of Christ and the ἵνα-clause ('that he might bring us to God') is found nowhere else in the N.T., although, as we shall see presently, there are certain notable parallels to the reference and the clause, respectively. For the sake of convenience and clarity, we shall examine each one of these three lines separately and in the given order.

a) The first line of the first half of the Christological credal formula reads as follows:

Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν .
(Christ died for sins once for all.)

The preposition περί is used in a few other N.T. passages, besides the one in I Ptr. 3:18a, in connection with the vicarious, redemptive death of Christ: one notable instance appears in the words of Jesus over the cup of wine at the Last Supper: "For this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many (περὶ πολλῶν)for the forgiveness of sins." (Mk. 14:24.)[1] In I Thess. 5:10, περί is connected with ἡμῶν : "(our Lord Jesus Christ), who died for us that whether we wake or sleep we might live with him."[1] We shall limit ourselves to examining Rom. 8:3; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10, in all of which the preposition περί is connected with 'sin(s).' Scholars such as Seufert, Foster and Barnett suggest that I Ptr. 3:18a might have been dependent upon Rom. 5:6, 8; 6:10 and 8:34. Therefore, these passages also will be touched upon briefly.

---

[1] Cf. e.g., Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, pp. 545-547. Also Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 118-132. Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl, pp. 109-111.

1. Rom. 8:3

The text of this verse reads as follows:

> τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί,
>
> (For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, RSV)

We begin with a general observation of the context. Rom. 8:1-11 seems to form a logical unit to assert the liberation of Christians from the 'law of sin and death,' and as such a unit this passage stands in contrast to the passage preceding it, 7:7-25.[2] Within

---

[1] Cf. N. A. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt" in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), p. 8.

[2] See, e.g., Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 158-159.

8:1-11, vss. 3-4 succinctly present the incarnation of Christ as the crucial event in bringing about liberation.[1] Now, the following features seem to distinguish vs. 3 from the rest of Romans (and the Pauline epistles), and suggests the possibility that Paul may have reproduced a piece of a pre-Pauline, traditional Christological formulation:

i) The use of πέμπω, which takes God and Christ as the subject and the object, respectively, is a *hapaxlegomenon* in the Pauline epistles (cf. Phil. 4:16; I Thess. 3:5; II Thess. 2:11).[2]

ii) Ὁμοίωμα to denote the mode of the incarnation is paralleled only in Phil. 2:7 (cf. Rom. 6:5), which seems to be part of a pre-Pauline Christological hymn.[3] The rare use of this word in the given sense may be noted, despite the fact that the word itself is found almost exclusively (with the exception of Rev. 9:7) in the Pauline epistles.

---

[1] See Otto Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1959), p. 490. Vs. 3ab may represent an *anakoluthon* (ibid., p. 491). Cf. E. Stauffer, *Die Theologie des N.Ts.*, p. 326. There Stauffer tabulates what he calls "die paradoxe Inkarnationsformeln bei Paulus und seinen Nachfolgern."

[2] A number of parallels to this use of πέμπω are found in the Fourth Gospel (e.g., 4:34; 5:23, 24, 30, 37; 6:38, 39, 44; 7:16, 18, 28, 33; 8:16, 29; 9:4; 12: 44, 45, 49; 14:24; 15:21).

[3] Cf. e.g., E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus* (2nd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1961), *passim*, and his *Der Brief an die Philipper* (*KEK*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 90-99. Bultmann, *Theologie des N.Ts.*, e.g., pp. 127-128; 133-134 and 178-180. E. Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5-11" in Vol. I of *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), pp. 51-95. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des N.Ts.*, pp. 178ff.
R. P. Martin's *An Early Christian Confession* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960) is to be compared with these.

iii) The phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας , used in association with the Christ-event, is a *hapax-legomenon* in the Pauline epistles (cf. περὶ ἡμῶν in I Thess. 5:10).[1] Although there is no explicit reference to the Passion of Christ in vs. 3, vs. 3c (καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί) may be taken to allude to it.[2] If this is the case, a number of possible parallels to περὶ ἁμαρτίας elsewhere in the N.T. (to which we shall return shortly) seem to suggest rather strongly that Paul may be drawing upon a piece of traditional Christological formulation, to emphasize the vicarious-redemptive significance of the death of Christ.

iv) One possible parallel instance, in the Pauline epistles, to the use of κατακρίνω , which takes God as its subject and sin as its object, if found in I Cor. 11:32 (cf. Mk. 16:16; II Ptr. 2:15).[3]

In view of these features, we agree with Michel who sees in vs. 3 "the historical event of the sending of the Son" strongly emphasized "in the form of an *old*

---

[1] On I Thess. 5:10, see Hahn, *Christologiesche Hoheitstitel*, pp. 202 and 210-211.

[2] Cf. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief*, pp. 495-496.

[3] See Büchsel in *TWNT*, III, 953.

tradition."[1]

Now, with regard to the possibility of a direct literary relationship between Rom. 8:3 and I Ptr. 3:18a, one may note the use of similar phrases with reference to the Christ-event (περὶ ἁμαρτίας, Rom.; περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, I Ptr.). The similarity of these two phrases will be enhanced when Rom. 8:3c is regarded as an allusion to the Passion as we have suggested above. In this it is like the Petrine passage (which has an explicit reference to the Passion). However, the possibility of a direct literary relationship appears to be lessened in view of the following considerations: first, Rom. 8:3c does not refer explicitly to the Passion, although one may infer an allusion to it; but the Petrine passage is concerned with the death of Christ.[2] Secondly, the contexts of these two passages are different. Thirdly, from a form-critical point of view also the two passages differ: while I Ptr. 3:18c is part of a Christological credal piece, Rom. 8:3 is not. In addition to these points, there are a few other minor differences: while Rom. 8:3c has ἁμαρτίας, I Ptr. 3:18a has its plural form ἁμαρτιῶν; in addition, while in the Romans passage, God is the subject of sending

---

[1] Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, p. 160 (the underlined words correspond to the words emphatically spaced by Michel).

[2] Cf. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," p. 7. Dahl classifies I Ptr. 3:18ab, along with Gal. 1:4; Eph. 5:25f.; Tit. 2:13f.; Jn. 11:51f., as one of the 'teleological schemata.'

Christ and condemning sin, Christ is the subject of ἀπέθανεν in the Petrine passage. In view of these differences, one may not assume the existence of a direct literary relationship between the two passages under consideration, although the similarity of the phrases and the possible allusion of Rom. 8:3c to the Passion seem to suggest a sort of history-of-tradition relationship between them. The latter relationship may be posited, at this stage of discussion, in view of the fact that both passages seem to draw upon (different) Christological formulations which would have intended to emphasize the vicarious-redemptive significance of the Passion.[1]

2. We now come to the parallel instance in I John 2:2; 4:10. The texts of these two passages are as follows:

I Jn. 2:2

καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.

(And he is the expiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world.)

---

[1] To the parallels to I Ptr. 3:18a we shall return presently.

I Jn. 4:10

ἐν τούτῳ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη , οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήκαμεν τὸν θεόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

(In this is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation for our sins. RSV)

We shall treat these passages together, since, despite certain contextual differences, an identical phrase ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν is used in them to emphasize the expiatory significance of the Christ-event.

I Jn. 2:2; 4:10 are marked by the use of ἱλασμός , a hapax-legomenon in the N.T. (cf. ἱλαστήριον in Rom. 3:25).[1] From a source-analytical point of view, Bultmann, for instance, thinks that what we have in I Jn. 2:1-2 is the Johannine writer's homiletical gloss of the source that he utilized in 1:5a-10;[2] i.e., because of his interest in the sentence about the forgiveness of sins, he formulated the statement in 2:2 by referring to what he calls the '*Gemeindogmatik*,' which underlies, in an unmodified manner, Rom. 3:25 and II Cor. 5:21.[1] What concerns us most at present is a possible history-of-tradition background of what is called by Bultmann '*Gemeindogmatik*,' on which the Johannine writer is dependent. Two problems are related to our present concern: first, the general frame of reference in which the significance of the Passion is conceived, i.e., an explication of the significance with reference of the sin of man; secondly, the use of the Greek word ἱλασμός . As to the first problem, one may say that, in view of a number of parallels to this frame of reference elsewhere in the N.T. (to which we shall return presently), the Johannine viewpoint may be traced back ultimately to the common, traditional scheme with which the early Church expounded the significance of the Passion. Concerning the second problem, the use

---

[1] Cf. Büchsel in TWNT, III, 321-324. Also C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1954), p. 94. See pp. 82ff.

On the history-of-tradition problem as related to Rom. 3:25, see Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 92-93. There Michel says, "Wir haben es hier mit feierlichen Formeln zu tun, die eine ältere Tradition verraten (vgl. I Kor. 11,25). Es wäre nicht verwunderlich, wenn die von Pls übernommenen Heilsbegriff ἀπολύτρωσις und ἱλαστήριον aus einer Abendmahlsliturgie stammen wurden. . . ."

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, "Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes" in Festgabe für Adolf Julicher (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1927), pp. 138-158; esp.

---

p. 141. The main thesis affirmed by Bultmann in this article is that the core source of I John is formulated in the style of a 'cosmological and religious dualism,' and the *Gattung* of this source is a 'revelation saying' (*Offenbarungsrede*). Bultmann carries out his detection of the core source primarily on the basis of style criticism. For critical remarks on the outcome of Bultmann's style criticism, see Friedrich Büchsel, "Zu den Johannesbriefen," *ZNW*, XXVIII (1929), 235-241. For a succinct criticism of Bultmann's attempt (i.e., to carry out source criticism primarily on the basis of style criticism), see Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (*HTKNT*; Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953), p. 11. Cf. pp. 10-13.

[1] Bultmann, "Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes," p. 141.

of ἱλασμός and its cognate terms appears to be notable. Ἱλασμός is used in the LXX either in a general sense of 'forgiveness' (Ps. 129:4, LXX; Dan. Th. 9:9) or in a cultic-sacrificial sense of 'the day of atonement' (Lev. 25:9; Num. 5:8) or 'sin offering' (Ezek. 44:27, 29). Its verb form ἱλάσκομαι (--ἱλάζω) is used in Ps. 24:11; 64:3; 77:38; 78:9 (LXX) and Lam. 3:42 with reference to sins, guilt or iniquities; ἐξιλάσκομαι, a cognate term of ἱλάσκομαι, in Sirach 5:6; 34:19 seems to carry the same connotation (cf. Sirach 3:3, 30; 20:28). From a history-of-concept point of view, ἱλασμός suggests its derivation from the O.T.-Jewish conceptual milieu; from a linguistic point of view, the use of this word in association with the Passion seems to have been made by the Johannine writer (or by the community upon which the writer might have been dependent) who was acquainted with the LXX usage of ἱλασμός and its cognate terms.[1] In addition to the two problems noted above, the use of the plural form of ἁμαρτία in 2:2; 4:10 (in view of the same usuage in 1:7 and 9) seems to suggest its connection with what Braun calls the 'spätjüdisch-gemeinchristliche' tradition.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 94-95.

[2] Herbert Braun, "Literar-Analyse und theologische Schichtung im ersten Johannesbrief," ZThK., XLVIII (1951), 265. The use of the singular form ἁμαρτία is found in I Jn. 1:8; 3:4, 5, 8, 9; 5:16. The difference in the use of these two forms may have a certain bearing upon a source-analytical study of the relevant passages, i.e., identifying redactoral glosses and also a

To sum up: a possible history-of-tradition background of the soteriological formulation in I Jn. 2:2; 4:10 may be sought in the so-called 'spätjüdisch-gemeinchristliche' milieu of tradition, with an additional possibility that the one who was responsible for the phrasing as we have it in these two passages, was in touch with the LXX usage of ἱλασμός and its cognate terms.

Now, as to the possibility of a direct literary relationship between these two Johannine passages (I Jn. 2:2; 4:10) and I Ptr. 3:18a, our observations will be dependent primarily upon terminological and form-critical considerations:[1] first, from a terminological (or literary) point of view, the absence of ἱλασμός, the pronoun ἡμῶν (as added to ἁμαρτιῶν in I Jn. 2:2; 4:10), a reference to the world-wide implication of the Christ-event (I Jn. 2:2) and an explicit remark about God as the subject of sending the Son are to be noted in I Ptr. 3:18a. In addition, while I Ptr. 3:18a has an explicit reference to the death of Christ, the expiatory significance of his coming is pre-eminent in the

---

history-of-tradition consideration, cf. Braun, ibid., pp. 264-265).

[1] A context-analytical consideration will not carry much weight as to the cases concerned, since these passages (I Ptr. 3:18a; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10) seem to reflect either a traditional Christological credal formula or a traditional soteriological formulation, incorporated into each particular context.

Johannine passages.[1] Secondly, from a form-critical point of view, I Ptr. 3:18a is part of a Christological credal piece with conspicuous formulary features; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10 (and their immediate contexts) do not seem to have such formulary features to represent a formulary character with a proper Gattung.[2] While we do note a remarkable similarity as to the general frame of reference in which the significance of the Christ-event is conceived (i.e., the significance of the event is emphasized with reference to sin), it appears to be difficult (in view of the considerations mentioned above) to assume a direct literary relationship between I Ptr. 3:18a and the Johannine passages. The similarity of the general frame of reference in the two cases (especially the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν) may have to be attributed to an underlying common, traditional view of the Christ-event current in the early Church.

---

[1] As a matter of course, an implicit allusion to the Passion may be inferred from the Johannine passages because of the cultic-sacrificial connotation of ἱλασμός . But this allusion is not emphasized.

[2] We would like to call the reader's attention to the fact that, as to the form-critical consideration, we rest our case primarily upon the absence of formulary features, and not upon the fact that, while one passage is a formulary piece with a proper Gattung, the other is not. It seems that the latter fact does not have a direct bearing upon the issue of literary dependence. While this may be the case, this very fact seems to suggest a complex problem from the viewpoint of 'analysis of traditional material,' and appears to be sufficient to restrain anyone from assuming a direct literary dependence, unless the assumption is supported by cogent exegetical elucidation.

The form-critical observation is to be regarded only as part of cumulative consideration (along with our notice of the literary-critical differences, on the one hand, and the prevalence of parallels elsewhere in the N.T.), and not as an independent piece of evidence.

3. In relation to our discussion of Rom. 8:3 and I Jn. 2:2; 4:10, we have pointed out that there are a number of parallel instances elsewhere in the N.T. to I Ptr. 3:18a and the passages just discussed. These instances may be listed as follows:

i) Prepositions with Personal Objects:-

'for you' (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν):

Lk. 22-19 (-20), "This is my body (which is given to you. Do this in remembrance of me. And like wise the cup after the supper, saying, This cup which is poured out for you is a new covenant in my blood)."[1]

I Cor. 11:24, "This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." (cf. I Cor. 1:13)

'for us' (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν):

Rom. 5:8, "But God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

II Cor. 5:21, "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God."

---

[1] For a succinct discussion on the text-critical problem involved in this passage, see Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl, pp. 101-102.

Gal. 3:13, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us."

Eph. 5:2, "And walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragment offering and sacrifice to God."

'for me' (ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ):

Gal: 2:20, ". . . and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

'for us' (περὶ ἡμῶν):

I Thess. 5:10, "(our Lord Jesus Christ, vs. 9) who died for us so that whether we wake or sleep we might live with him."

'for many' (ὑπὲρ πολλῶν):

Mk. 14:24, "And he said to them, 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many."

'for every one' (ὑπὲρ παντός):

Heb. 2:9, "But we see Jesus, who for a while was made lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for every one."

'for the ungodly' (ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν):

Rom. 5:6, "While we were yet helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly."

'for the unrighteous' (ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων):

I Ptr. 3:18, ". . . the righteous for the unrighteous."

'for the brother':

Rom. 14:15b, "Do not let what you eat cause the ruin of the one for whom Christ died (ὑπὲρ οὗ; οὗ refers to ἀδελφός in vs. 15a).

I Cor. 8:11, "And so by your knowledge this weak man is destroyed, the brother for whom Christ died (ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν).

'for the people' (ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ):

Jn. 11:50, "You do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, . . ."

Jn. 18:14, "It was Caiaphas who had given counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die for the people."

'for the nation' (ὑπερ τοῦ ἔθνους):

Jn. 11:51, "He did not say this of his own accord, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation."

Cf. Jn. 10:11, 15b.

ii) Prepositions with Objects other than Personal Ones:-

'for sin' (περὶ ἁμαρτίας):

Rom. 8:3, "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh,"

'for sins' (περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν):

I Ptr. 3:18a, "For Christ also died for sins once for all,"

'for our trespasses' (διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν):

Rom. 4:25, "(Jesus our Lord, vs. 24), who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification."

'for our sins' (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν):

I Cor. 15:3, "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures,"

Gal. 1:4, "(our Lord Jesus Christ, vs. 3), who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father";[1]

'for our sins' (περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν):

I Jn. 2:2, "And he is the expiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world."

---

[1] Ὑπέρ is supported by p^{51} B H 33 1611 and a majority of the leading witnesses. Περί is attested by p^{46} ℵ* ℜ D G and others.

I Jn. 4:10, "In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation for our sins."

'for the church':

Eph. 5:25, "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her (ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ; αὐτῆς refers back to τὴν ἐκκλησίαν)."

'for the life of the world' (ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς):

Jn. 6:51c, "And the bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh."

This list of parallels to I Ptr. 3:18a seems to indicate at once the prevalence of these various Christological formulations throughout the N.T. The prevalence and the variety suggest, first, that the formulations to denote the vicarious-redemptive significance of the Passion were so common and integral to the life and thought of the early Church that the formulations were made in diverse manners for various purposes, or were incorporated into various contexts: e.g., as part of a theological discourse (Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 5:6, 8; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; 3:13; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 2:9; I Jn. 2:9. Cf. II Cor. 5:14, 15; I Tim. 2:6), as part of an extended Superscripto (Gal. 1:4. Cf. vss. 3-5), as part of a hortatory context (II Cor. 5:21; I Thess. 5:10; I Jn. 3:16a; 4:10), or as part of the 'saying' tradition (Mk. 10:45; 14:24; Matt. 20:28; 26:28; Lk. 22:19-20;

I Cor. II: 24; Jn. 6:51; 10:11, 15; 15:13).[1] Secondly, the basis for these formulations may have been laid during the earliest period in the life of the Church, with the possibility that the basic line of understanding behind these formulations (i.e., the vicarious-redemptive significance of the death of Christ) may have originated in the 'words of Jesus,' or in what were so deemed by the primitive Church which conserved them. As to this origin in the 'words of Jesus,' we have already studied (in relation to our discussion of I Ptr. 1:18-19 in Chapter V) the history-of-tradition problems related to Mk. 10:45 as well as to Rom. 3:24-25 and Tit. 2:14,; furthermore, such passages as Rom. 4:25; II Cor. 5:21 and the words of Jesus about the cup of wine at the Last Supper were touched upon briefly in the same chapter. From a history-of-tradition point of view, it appears to be evident that the basic line of understanding behind these formulations did not originate in Paul's own theologico-literary ingenuity, in view of what was said about the passages mentioned above, e.g., Rom. 3:24-25; 4:25; I Cor. 11:24; II Cor. 5:21, as well as I Cor. 15:3 (-4).[2] Due caution is to be observed, therefore, when we inquire into the possibility of a direct literary relationship between any one of the passages from the Pauline epistles (which seem to reflect that basic line of understanding) and any passage from the rest of the N.T. which seems to correspond to a Pauline passage.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Jn. 11:50-51; 18:14. These Johannine passages refer to Caiaphas' prediction about the vicarious death of Christ.

On various patterns of Christological formulations, see Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," *passim*.

[2] On the pre-Pauline character of I Cor. 15:3-4, see e.g., Alfred Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung

---

Nachf., 1903), pp. 45-58; E. Lichtenstein, "Die älteste christliche Glaubensformel," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXIII (1950), 1-74; Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp. 129-130; Paul Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl* (München: Kosel-Verlag, 1960), p. 84; Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (2nd ed.; 1961), pp. 15-17, 31 and 117-118.

On the similarity shared by I Ptr. 3:18a and I Cor. 15:3, Foster comments, "The thought and phrasing are close, but too common to base any argument upon them," and he ascribes the lowest degree of probability (d) to the similarity (*The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter,"* p. 419). However, what Foster could have done instead, would have been to inquire into the nature of that so-called 'too common' affinity from the viewpoint of 'analysis of traditional material.' This line of inquiry might have helped him to see the similarity against a history-of-tradition background.

[1] After eliminating I Jn. 2:2; 4:10 from his estimation of these passages as parallels to I Ptr. 3:18a, Beare remarks, "There are, then, only three passages in the N.T. which afford true parallels to the phrase now before us. 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' (I Cor. 15:3); 'He gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from this present evil world' (Gal. 1:4); 'He offered one sacrifice for sins forever' (Heb. 10:12). To these we might add the similar phrase (with a different preposition) of Romans 4:25--'He was delivered for our offences'--παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν ." (*The First Epistle of Peter*, p. 142) It is not clear what Beare means by 'true parallels.' From a conceptual point of view, Beare should have taken the numerous instances, which we have listed above, into his consideration. And from a history-of-tradition point of view, Beare should at least have inquired into the probability that in I Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4; Rom. 4:25. Paul may have referred to certain traditional kerygmatic formulations. From the viewpoint of asking about a direct literary relationship between I Ptr. 3:18a and these 'true parallels,' Beare's comments are not

4. Let us briefly survey such passages as Rom. 5:6, 8; 6:10 and 8:34, upon which, so it appears to some scholars, I Ptr. 3:18a might have depended.

Rom. 5:6, 8 is set side by side with I Ptr. 3:18a by Foster, who ascribes a higher degree of probability of dependence (b) to the similarity shared by these passages:[1]

I Ptr. 3:18a	Rom. 5:6
Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν .	Χριστὸς . . . ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν .
	Rom. 5:8
	Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν.

Since Foster's remark on these passages is limited primarily to a text-critical observation about ἀπέθανεν in the Petrine passage, we shall go on to point out a few reasons why the similarity shared by the Petrine passage and the Romans passage may not be taken as the evidence for the former's literary dependence upon the latter:

i) As parallel passages to I Ptr. 3:18a, Foster lists from the Pauline epistles only these two Romans passages. Nevertheless, as we have surveyed them above, there are also additional parallels to the Petrine passage. Before limiting himself to the two

---

explicit, and are in need of a cogent exegetical substantiation.

[1] Foster, *The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter,"* p. 432.

Romans passages, Foster certainly could have mentioned such a passage as I Cor. 15:3 (Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν . . .),[1] which is closer to the Petrine passage. Foster's list of parallels is unjustifiably limited.

ii) Within the Pauline epistles, there are, as we have already noted, several parallel passages which seem to reflect traditional Christological formulations of presumably pre-Pauline origin (e.g., Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 8:3; I Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4. Cf. Eph. 5:25). The history-of-tradition relationships of these parallel passages (along with those of Rom. 5:6, 8; I Ptr. 3:18a) should have been explored. To assume the priority of one passage over another merely on the basis of a formal comparison (unless the evidence adduced from this comparison is significant enough to outweigh the possible history-of-tradition consideration), will not be doing full justice to the nature of those parallel passages which may well have depended upon older, common traditional material.

iii) There are certain literary-critical differences between I Ptr. 3:18a and Rom. 5:6, 8 which seem to hinder us from assuming a direct literary relationship as taken for granted: first, the objects of the vicarious death of Christ in the Romans passages are (ὑπέρ) ἀσεβῶν and (ὑπὲρ) ἡμῶν , while the object of the redemptive death is (περὶ) ἁμαρτιῶν : secondly, different prepositions (i.e., ὑπέρ and περί) are used; thirdly, the emphatic adverb ἅπαξ (cf. Heb. 9:26) does not appear in the immediate context of the Romans passages;[1] the adverb is used in II Cor. 11:25; Phil. 4:16 and I Thess. 2:18 in the sense of 'once,' and with no reference to the Christ-event. Fourthly, the contexts of these allegedly parallel passages do not coincide: in the immediate context of the Romans passages (vss. 6-11), Paul elucidates the basis of the justification of Christians by appealing to God's love which was brought to its realization in the death of His Son; I Ptr. 3:18a is placed within a hortatory context in order to point out the exemplary character of the death of Christ (cf. vss. 13-17).

---

[1] Cf. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 117. Michel says (on Rom. 5:6), "An die Bekenntnisformel I Kor.15, 3 erinnert die Aussage, dass Christus fur Gottlose starb."

iv) From a form-critical point of view, I Ptr. 3:18a is part of a traditional Christological credal formulation. This fact seems to suggest a possibility that the similarity, which this passage shares with the Romans passages, may not necessarily be taken as evidence that the Petrine passage directly depends upon the passages in Romans; rather one may postulate, as one possibility, their common derivation from an older kerygmatic formulation current in the early Church.

---

[1] See the use of ἐφάπαξ in Rom. 6:10. Cf. Heb. 7:27; 9:12; 10:10.

It is of course possible to maintain that, while an ultimate derivation from an older kerygmatic formulation may be granted, one can still assume the existence of a direct literary relationship between the passages concerned, by postulating the priority of the Romans passages and a direct dependence upon these passages, together with an indirect derivation from the older kerygmatic formulation on the side of the Petrine passages. The burden of exegetical proof, however, is on the one who maintains this view; he should account for the four problems we have pointed out above.

With regard to Rom. 6:10[1] and 8:34[2] on the basis of which the direct dependence of I Ptr. 3:18a is assumed by Seufert and Beare, the central observations that we made on I Ptr. 3:18a and Rom. 5:6, 8, especially with

---

[1] On Rom. 6:10, see W. Seufert, "Das Abhängigkeitsverständniss des l. Petrusbrief vom Römerbrief," Zeitschrift für wissenschftliche Theologie, XVI (1874), 382. Also Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 142. On the use of ἅπαξ in I Ptr. 3:18a, Beare comments, "He [the Petrine writer] probably has in mind the words of Romans 6:10. . . ."

Compare these views with Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 128-134. Cf. Hermann Gunkel, "Der erste Brief des Petrus," in Vol. III of Die Schriften des N.Ts. (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), p. 280.

[2] On Rom. 8:34, see Seufert, op. cit., p. 377. Seufert's discussion of this verse as well as Rom. 6:10 is directed primarily toward terminological similarities.

Compare this procedure with Boismard, Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la première épître de Pierre, p. 103. Boismard notes the resemblance between Rom. 8:34 and I Ptr. 3:18-22 (and Acts 10:42; II Tim. 4:1), and suggests that a '(kerygmatic) formula pertaining to the regard to difficulties in assuming the existence of a direct literary relationship between them, seem to be applicable here also. It is unnecessary to outline the arguments put forward by these scholars, since their arguments do not seem to amount to much.[1] It will suffice to note that the views that assume a direct literary relationship between these passages (Rom. 6:10; 8:34) and I Ptr. 3:18a seem to invite several serious questions which the authors of these views do not cope with on a cogent exegetical basis.

The outcome of our examination of the parallel passages to I Ptr. 3:18a may be outlined as follows:

1. The parallels that we have in Rom. 8:3; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10 (as to the phrase περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν) are not sufficiently striking to enable us to assert a direct literary relationship between any one of them and the Petrine passage. The affinities among them are to be attributed, so it seems, to the fact that (possibly independent from each other) they may have drawn upon a traditional Christological formulation which could have assumed various forms or have been incorporated into diverse theological-parenetic contexts in the N.T. writings.

---

confession of faith' seems to be reflected in them. Cf. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, p. 186.

[1] See the footnotes on previous page.

2. As some instances in the Pauline epistles suggest, the original formulation may be presumed to be of pre-Pauline origin.

3. Such passages as Rom. 5:6, 8; 6:10; 8:34, upon which I Ptr. 3:18a might allegedly have depended, seem to reflect a similar Christological outlook. However, various literary-critical differences prevent us from assuming a direct literary dependence between the Petrine passage, on the one hand, and any one of these parallel passages, on the other. The same history-of-tradition observation made on Rom. 8:3; I Jn. 2:2; 4:10 seems to be pertinent here also.

b) The second line of the first half of the Christological credal formula reads as follows:

ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ
(that he might bring us to God)

The subject of προσαγάγῃ is, of course, Christ. The verb προσάγω is used, besides the instance in this Petrine passage, also in Lk. 9:41; Acts 16:20, both transitively, and in Acts 27:27, intransitively. Its substantival form προσαγωγή is found in Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 3:12. While the instance in the latter passages as well as that in I Ptr. 3:18b are concerned with denoting the redemptive-reconciling act of Christ or the new relationship of Christians to God, such a soteriological connotation is altogether absent from the former passages.[1] Therefore, we shall limit ourselves to an examination of the instances in Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 3:12 as well as the Petrine passage under study. In addition to these, the use of a conceptually correlative word παρρησία especially as we find it in Heb. 10:19 (-20) seems noteworthy; a brief remark will be made on that passage also.

i) In relation to I Ptr. 3:18b, a short history-of-concept survey of the idea expressed by προσάγω seems to be in place. We shall limit ourselves to surveying the instances with more or less explicit religious connotations.

1. To the first type belong those instances where προσάγω takes sacrificial-cultic objects as the direct object. A Classical instance of this type may be found in Herodotus 3:24 (θυσίας τινι).[2] A number of parallel instances are found in the O.T. (LXX), in which קרב or בוא are rendered by προσάγω.[3] The verb stands for a presentation of sacrificial animals or offerings.

2. Instances of the second type are those which denote cultic acts. Num. 27:5 ("Moses brought their

---

[1] Numerous instances of the non-religious use of προσάγω are cited in Liddell-Scott, pp. 1499-1500. Cf. Num. 25:6.

[2] Liddell-Scott, p. 1499.

[3] E.g., Ex. 29:10; Lev. 1:3; 3:3; 4:14; 7:16; II Chron. 29:31; I Esdras 1:18; II Macc. 12:43.

cares to God") and Tobit 12:12 (". . . I did bring the remembrance of your prayers before the Holy One") refer to intercessory acts. Ex. 29:4, 8; 40:12; Lev. 8:24 and Num. 8:9, 10 are concerned with the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and the Levites, respectively. Ex. 21:6 ("Then his master shall bring him to God, and shall bring him to the door or the doorpost," is about a legal transaction of the status of a slave which takes a form of a (quasi-) cultic act.

3. An instance in the Apocrypha is presented as an apocalyptic description of the enthronement scene of God. This example in I Enoch 47:3-4 reads as follows:[1]

> In those days I saw the Head of Days when he seated himself upon the throne of his glory, and the book of the living were opened before Him:
> And all His host which is in heaven above and His counsellors stood before Him,
> And the hearts of the holy were filled with joy;
> Because the number of the righteous had been offered,[2]

---

[1] E.t. by Charles in Charles, APOT, I, 216. A reference to this Enoch passage is made, in relation to Eph. 2:18, by Schlier in his Der Brief an die Epheser, p. 139.

[2] On the phrase 'been offered' Charles comments, "A late sense of קרב misrendered 'drawn nigh' here." (Charles, loc. cit.)
Cf. Xenophon I:3:8 (Schmidt in TWNT, I, 132-133).

And the prayer of the righteous had been heard,
And the blood of the righteous been required
before the Lord of Spirits.

4. Instances of the fourth type denote figuratively God's providential care of the believer;[1] in these instances, a synonymous word ὁδηγέω is used primarily for נחה or דרך .[2] Most of these cases are found in the Psalms, and they take God as the subject of 'leading' or 'guiding.'[3]

5. Instances which belong to the fifth type convey the metaphorical expression of guidance by the personified Wisdom; they are found in the Wisdom of Solomon 9:11; 10:10, 17. Ὁδηγέω is used here to denote the act of guiding. This verb takes, impersonal subjects such as '(God's) light and truth' (Ps. 42:3, LXX) or 'the integrity of the upright' (Prov. 11:3).

6. The sixth type is represented by the figure of a μυσταγωγός , or a ὁδηγὸς τῆς ψυχῆς , of the Mystery cults. Perdelwitz notes certain similarities between this figure and Christ as depicted in I Ptr. 3:18 (a-)b.[4]

---

[1] E.g., Ps. 5:8; 22 (23):3; 24(25):5, 9; 26(27):11; 30 (31):3; 60 (61):2; 66 (67):4; 72 (73):24; 76 (77):20; 77 (78):14, 53, 72; 79 (80):1; 105 (106):9; 106 (107): 7, 30; 118 (119):35; 138 (139):10, 14.

[2] נהג in Ps. 79 (80):1. הלך in Ps. 105 (106):9.

[3] In Ps. 42 (43):3, a king is the subject of 'riding forth victoriously.'

[4] R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des I. Petrusbriefes* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1911), pp. 85-86. Hermann Gunkel, "Der erste Brief des Petrus," p. 280. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, pp. 142-143. Cf. E. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*

Which one of these types is to be regarded as a history-of-concept parallel to I Ptr. 3:18b? There are three elements in this passage; i.e., Christ as the subject of προσάγω, Christians as the direct object and God as the indirect object.

A redeemer figure or a person with a mediatorial function corresponding to the role of Christ in this Petrine passage may be found in the instances of the first, second (Num. 27:5; Tobit 12:12) and sixth types. Votaries or neophytes (i.e., personal objects) corresponding to Christians in I Ptr. 3:18b may be found in the instances classified under the second, fourth, fifth and sixth types. Those instances which take God (or deities) as the indirect object are represented in the first, second and third types. In view of the variety to be found in these instances and the differences between them and I Ptr. 3:18b, it seems difficult to pin down any one of these types as forming an immediate history-of-concept parallel to this Petrine passage.[1]

(4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), pp. 52-58 and 79-82.

[1] Perdelwitz, who tries to explain I Ptr. 3:18b in terms of its being parallel to the μυσταγωγός -figure of the Mystery cults, has yet to account for the parallels which we find in the O.T. and the related literature. Schlier, who sees an enthronement scene (as depicted in I Enoch 47:3-4) behind Eph. 2:18; 3:12 as well as Heb. 10:19 (-20), owes us a similar explanation.

K. L. Schmidt rightly observes various shades of meaning in the προσάγω of I Ptr. 3:18b. His attempt to explain each shade of meaning by referring to possible history-of-concept parallels appears to be suggestive. However, when he tries to establish a conceptual

All that can be said about I Ptr. 3:18b is that this passage may be regarded as a figurative expression of a cultic nature;[1] this passage is too brief for anything more definite to be concluded about it.

ii) Let us go on to examine the parallel passages in Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 3:12 and Heb. 10:19 (-20) in the given order.

1. The text of Rom. 5:1-2 is as follows:

Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν (τῇ πίστει)[2] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν, καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ.

(Therefore, since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Through him we have obtained access to this grace in which we stand, and we rejoice in our hope of sharing the glory of God. RSV)

---

association between the consecration of sacerdotal figures (e.g., Ex. 29:4, 8; 40:12; Lev. 8:24; Num. 8:9, 10) and the imagery of 'bringing Christians' to God, by appealing to the fact that Christians are described as sacerdotal figures elsewhere in I Peter (2:9), this attempt is not convincing from a methodical point of view, since, in order to do this, Schmidt would have to establish that I Ptr. 2:9 is also of a traditional formulary nature with, presumably, the same history-of-concept background.

[1] See Windisch-Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, pp. 70-71.

[2] Inclusion of this phrase is supported by ℌ 𝔎 pl vg sy. This phrase is omitted in B D G it Or^{lat}.

We shall begin with a general observation about the context. This passage, Rom. 5:1-2, seems to form one context-analytical unit: first, because it takes up a theme presented in the immediately preceding verse (i.e., διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν in 4:25b) and develops it as a basis of the new status of Christians (see δικαιωθέντες οὖν), and secondly, because it is followed in vss. 3-5 by a new theme of 'rejoicing (also) in tribulation.'[1] This passage sets forth the new status of Christians in terms of their having peace with God and rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God.

The similarity between Rom. 5:(1-) 2 and I Ptr. 3:18b may be noted in the fact that both passages are concerned with the new access to grace on the part of Christians, and both refer to Christ as the one who has brought about this access. As one of the pieces of supplementary evidence for a direct (literary) dependence of I Ptr. 3:18 upon Rom. 5:6, Barnett appeals to the similarity represented in the use of προσάγω -- προσαγωγή .[2] The combination of the two ideas, 'Christ's

---

[1] Cf. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 113. Also Kuss, Der Römerbrief, pp. 200-201.

[2] Barnett, Paul Becomes A Literary Influence, p. 64. Barnett says, "The two ideas in I Ptr. 3:18 of Christ's death for sinful man and of the resulting access to God can both be accounted for from Romans. The contrast involved and the language used also related the passage to Romans." In addition to the use of προσάγω -- προσαγωγή , Barnett refers to the use of ζωοποιέω (in I Ptr. 3:18), which appears, in Barnett's view, "in the N.T. only in Paul's letters and in the writings clearly influenced by his letters."

Now, on Barnett's remark on ζωοποιέω , the following death for sinful man' and 'the resulting access to God,' as pointed out by Barnett, as well as the terminological features, will be regarded as supporting Barnett's contention. There are, however, the following literary-critical differences which appear to caution us against assuming a direct literary dependence:

1. The verb form of προσάγω with a soteriological connotation is limited, in the N.T., to I Ptr. 3:18b, while the substantival form is used in Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 3:12.

2. In I Ptr. 3:18b, Christ Himself is the subject of an active form of προσάγω, while in Rom. 5:2, Christians are the ones who obtain the access.

---

critical observation may be made:

1. This verb appears in Jn. 5:21; 6:63 as well as in Rom. 4:17; 8:11; I Cor. 15:22, 36, 45; II Cor. 3:6; Gal. 3:21 (and I Ptr. 3:18). As to the Johannine instances, Barnett owes us an elucidation of the alleged Pauline influence.

2. This verb in I Ptr. 3:18 refers to the resurrection of Christ, while the Pauline and Johannine instances refer to the reviving power of God (Rom. 4:17; Jn. 5:21), to that of the Spirit (II Cor. 3:6; Jn. 6:63) or to the resurrection of Christians (Rom. 8:11; I Cor. 15:11. Cf. I Cor. 15:45; Gal. 3:21). An allusion to the resurrection of Christ may be inferred only from I Cor. 15:36. Conceptual and terminological parallels to ζωοποιέω are found in the O.T.-Jewish writings as well as in the Classical and Hermetical literature (Bultmann in TWNT, II, 876).

3. Ζωοποιέω in I Ptr. 3:18 is part of an antithetical parallelism of a 'formulary' nature. The contrast of 'flesh'--'spirit' does not appear in the immediate context of Rom. 5:6 (5:1-11). A form-critical (as well as a history-of-tradition) consideration is to be given to the Petrine antithetical parallelism before singling out ζωοποιέω.

3. The indirect object of προσάγω in I Ptr. 3:18b is God, while 'the grace in which we stand' is the object to which προσάγω is directed (εἰς) in Rom. 5:2.[1] The Petrine passage sets out a cultic implication more clearly.

4. The motif of justification of Christians by faith (cf. Rom. 5:2) is not explicitly presented in the immediate context of I Ptr. 3:18b (vss. 18, 19, 22) (or I Peter as a whole).

5. The expression to designate the new status of Christians as the establishment of a reconciling relationship with God is not found in I Ptr. 3:18, 19, 22 (or anywhere in I Peter).

We have already pointed out (in connection with our comparative examination of I Ptr. 3:18a and Rom. 5:6) that a direct literary relationship may not be assumed to exist between I Ptr. 3:18a and Rom. 5:6 because of literary-critical and history-of-tradition consideration. If that which we have pointed out is correct, and if the difficulties which we have listed above are again brought into consideration, first, it seems hardly possible to postulate a direct literary relationship between I Ptr. 3:18b and Rom. 5:2; secondly, the similarity between these two passages, as represented in the use of προσάγω -- προσαγωγή, may be ascribed to the fact that Paul and the original composer of the Christological credal piece in I Peter were drawing upon the same Bildkreis current in the early Church, while they developed the figurative expressions differently, i.e., soteriologically and Christologically, respectively.

---

[1] See Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe, p. 276.

2. Our second passage is Eph. 2:18; the text of this passage is as follows:

> ὅτι δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (= τοῦ Χριστοῦ , vs. 13) ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα .
>
> (for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father. RSV)

The similarity shared by this Ephesians passage and I Ptr. 3:18b may be seen in the fact that these two passages are concerned with the access of Christians to God (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα) and both regard Christ as the one who has brought about this access. The basic affinity between the two passages is so close that one would make a better case for a literary relationship here than between I Ptr. 3:18b and Rom. 5:2. Foster, for instance, ascribes a relatively high degree (b) of probability of literary dependence (on the side of the Petrine passage) to this affinity;[1] and, without presenting his own remarks, he quotes a statement made by

---

[1] Foster, The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," p. 449.

Abbott, "I Pt. 3:18 reminds us of Eph. 2:18, while the verses immediately following exhibit the ancient explanation of Eph. 4:8-9."[1]

However, the probability of the existence of a direct literary relationship between Eph. 2:18 and I Ptr. 3:18b appears to be lessened by a few literary-critical differences between the two passages;[2] above all, it is reduced considerably by the following observation: in order to assume a direct literary dependence of I Ptr. 3:18b on Eph. 2:18, one seems to have to assume that the original composer of a Christological credal formulation in I Ptr. 3:18, 19 and 22 modelled the formula on Eph. 2:18 and its immediate context, and revealed his dependence by leaving traces of it in the form of the 'basic affinity' we have noted in the preceding paragraph. Now, while there are partial

---

[1] A quotation is made from T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (*ICC*; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), p. xxv.

[2] The following differences may be noted:

1. Eph. 2:18 has προσαγωγή , of which the subject is Jewish and Gentile Christians; προσάγω in I Ptr. 3:18b is the only N.T. instance of a verbal form with a soteriological connotation, and it is used transitively.
2. The phrase ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι in Eph. 2:18, as contrasted with ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι in vs. 16, emphasizes the equivalence of the status of Gentile and Jewish Christians (cf. Schlier, *Der Brief and die Epheser*, p. 139). No explicit reference to the equivalence is made in the immediate context of the Petrine Christological credal formula.
3. I Ptr. 3:18b modifies ἀπέθανεν in vs. 18b, while a reference to the death of Christ in Eph. 2:18 (δι᾽ αὐτοῦ . Cf. vss. 13-17) is indirect.

The weight of these differences may be negligible;

references, in Eph. 2:13ff., to the death of Christ,[1] there is no parallel in the Ephesians context to the simple, succinct formulation, which we have in I Ptr. 3:18a; rather, as we have noted elsewhere,[2] there are closer parallels to I Ptr. 3:18a in the Pauline passages of which a pre-Pauline, traditional character may well be presumed. What we have in Eph. 2:13ff. appears to be a presentation of the significance of the death of Christ in a reflective manner, i.e., adapting the traditional, pre-Pauline formulation for the purpose of asserting an equal status of Jews and Gentiles as to their relationship to God. That I Ptr. 3:18a is much closer, e.g., to I Cor. 15:3 than to Eph. 2:13ff., seems to suggest that, from a history-of-tradition point of view, a direct dependence of I Ptr. 3:18ab upon Eph. 2:13-17 may not be concluded as an assured fact. If this line of thinking is a justifiable one, the remarkable affinity shared by the Petrine passage concerned (vs. 18b) and Eph. 2:18 may be attributed to the fact that these two passages drew upon the same Christological figurative expression (though probably independent from each other) which had become commonplace in the

---

but they are in need of elucidation by the one who insists upon a direct literary relationship.

[1] See ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Eph. 2:13. Ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, vs. 14. Διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, vs. 16.

[2] See pp. 320ff.

early Church. In view of the direct, concise formulations as well as the parallels in the pre-Pauline formulations as represented in the Pauline epistles, it seems possible that I Ptr. 3:18 (a-)b might represent an older form than that in Eph. 2:18.

The history-of-tradition place of προσαγωγή in Eph. 3:12 may be understood likewise. A notable feature of this passage is that παρρησία is used almost synonymously with προσάγω.[1] This leads us to an examination of παρρησία in Heb. 10:19(-20).

3. Heb. 10:19(-20), our third passage, reads as follows:

> Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τουτ᾽ ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. (Therefore, brethren, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain, that is through his flesh. RSV)

This passage is an introductory part[2] of the last larger unit in Hebrews, composed of 10:19-13:25, and it sets out a theological basis for the hortatory discourse which follows.[1] As elsewhere in Hebrews, this passage also is endowed with cultic imageries (see εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων , vs. 19).

---

[1] Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, p. 91.

[2] See the use of ἀδελφοί in vs. 19. Cf. 3:12; 13:12.

The word παρρησία , with which we are concerned at present, is used in Classical and Hellenistic literature to denote outspokenness, boldness or freedom of sppech and action.[2] Among the LXX instances of this word, notable ones are those that signify man's openness before God, such as we find in Job 22:23-27; 27:9-10.[3] As to the phrasing of παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον (τῶν ἁγίων) (Heb. 10:19), instead of παρρησίαν τοῦ εἰσιέναι , Westcott seems right in his rendering it "boldness to use the entrace (into the Holy place)," and in his thinking it to refer (distinctly) to "both the characteristic act of the Highpriest and the provision made by Christ."[4] That is, παρρησία appears to denote the authorization by a sacerdotal figure of a direct access to the sanctuary.[1] Although set in a cultic imagery, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων seems to represent a conceptual affinity to the idea expressed in I Ptr. 3:18b.

---

[1] Cf. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, pp. 228-230. Also C. Spicq, *L'epître aux Hebreux* (2nd ed.; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1953), Vol. III, pp. 314-315.

[2] See Liddell-Scott, p. 1344. Also Schlier in *TWNT*, V, 869-877.

[3] Schlier, *ibid.*, p. 873.

[4] B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), p. 318. Cf. Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

Now, the similarity between Heb. 10:19-20 and I Ptr. 3:18 (a-)b may be seen, in addition to the affinity between παρρησία and προσάγω in the respective passages, also in the following points: first, Christians are the ones who obtain the authorization of a direct access to the divine presence; secondly, the death of Christ[2] is regarded as that which brings about this privileged status; thirdly, the indirect object of this access is the divine presence.

Despite these similar features, conspicuous differences in phrasing,[3] figurative expression[4] and form-

---

[1] Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, p. 229. Cf. E. Käsemann, Das wandernde Gottesvolk, p. 23. Schlier, TWNT, V, 882-883. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Churches of the Gentiles (Cambridge: The University Press, 1939), p. 170, fn. 1.

[2] See ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, vs. 19; διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος τουτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, vs. 20.

[3] On the differences in phrasing, see the following:

I Ptr. 3:18	Heb. 10:19-20
1. προσαγάγῃ	1. ἔχοντες παρρησίαν
2. τῷ θεῷ	2. εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων
3. Χριστὸς . . . ἀπέθανεν	3. ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ (Cf. σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, vs.20)
4. (no counterpart)	4. τὴν εἴσοδον . . ., ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν . . . ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν.

[4] In Heb. 10:19 (-20), Christians are compared to the sacerdotal figure which has a direct and free access to the divine presence, or the Holy place. In I Ptr.

critical features,[1] appear to restrain us from assuming the existence of a direct literary relationship between the two passages concerned. The affinity shared by these two passages may have originated in the fact that they might have depended upon the same (or a similar) Bildkreis, formulated for a soteriological explication of the Christ-event.

The outcome of our examination of the parallel passages in A (b) may be summed up as follows: the similarity shared by I Ptr. 3:18b, on the one hand, and Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18 (3:12); Heb. 10:19 (-20), on the other hand, seems remarkable, though with differences in degree. While it appears to be difficult to assume the existence of a direct literary dependence between this Petrine passage and any one of the parallel passages, it seems likely that the similarity may instead be attributed to the fact that they all drew upon the same (or a similar) Bildkreis, formulated to explicate the soteriological significance of the Christ-event, notably the death of Jesus.

3:18b, Christ assumes the role of a sacerdotal intermediary who escorts Christians into the divine presence; the cultic imagery is less explicit than in the former passage.

[1] I Ptr. 3:18b is part of a traditional Christological credal piece. The Christological reference in Heb. 10:19-20 does not have any liturgical-formulary features, nor can it claim a proper Gattung for itself or its immediate context.

c) We come to the third line of the first half of the Christological credal piece. The text of this line is as follows:

καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν (vs. 19)

(and He preached to the spirits in prison)

This line is probably (along with vs. 20) the locus vexatissimus in I Peter as a whole.[1] Our present inquiry will take the following two steps: first, we shall identify, in a summary fashion, the history-of-concept parallels to πνεύματα and φυλακῇ as used in this line. Secondly, we shall examine, from a history-of-tradition point of view, possible N.T. allusions to the idea expressed in the line under consideration.

i) As to the identity of the 'spirits in prison,' the following views have been maintained:

1. The 'spirits' may be identified with the 'fallen angels,' speculation about which was fabricated on the basis of Gen. 6:1ff., and was current in certain Jewish circles.[2]

---

[1] On the history-of-religion parallels to the idea of descent of a divine figure into an underworld, see Joseph Kroll, Gott und Hölle (Leipzig/Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1932). Also Chaine, "Descente du Christ aux Enfers," Vol. II of Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, columns 395-431; esp. 395-410.

[2] See Test. Naphtali 3:5; II Baruch 56:10-16; Jubilee 5:6; Damascus Document 2:16-21; Genesis Apocryphon 2:1, 16; I Enoch 16. Cf. II Ptr. 2:4, 9; Jude 6.

Spitta,[1] Gunkel,[2] Knopf,[3] Hauck,[4] Selwyn,[5] Reicke[6] and Jeremias[7] seem to do this.

---

[1] Friedrich Spitta, *Christi Predigt an die Geister (1 Petr. 3, 19ff.)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1890).

[2] H. Gunkel, "Der erste Brief des Petrus" in Vol. III of *Die Schriften des N.Ts.*, pp. 281-282.

[3] R. Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä* (*KEK*, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912), p. 152. Cf. pp. 149-152.

[4] Friedrich Hauck, *Die Kirchenbriefe* (*NTD*, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 69-70.

[5] Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 199. Selwyn's remark is a qualified one: while he thinks that the "primary reference" concerning the 'spirits in prison' is to "such supernatural beings," or the 'fallen angels,' he does not exclude the possibility that, "in St. Peter's mind," the spirits also included the 'wicked dead,' or the contemporaries of Noah. With this reservation, Selwyn stands close to the view held by Windisch, to which we shall return shortly.

[6] Bo Reicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism* (København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1946), pp. 90-91. Cf. pp. 52ff. Reicke's view is also a qualified one: "On the basis of the context it seems that I Pet. with πνεύματα in iii. 19 can allude both to spirits in the meaning of Angels and to the souls of the dead people"; this remark is followed by another statement, "Considering the quite clear connection with the *Book of Enoch*, it is probably most important to think of the fallen Angels and their descendants mentioned in Gen. vi. 1-4, who plays a very great role in the *Book of Enoch* and similar writings." (*Ibid.*, p. 90.)

[7] Jeremias, "Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern," *ZNW*, XXXX (1949), 194-201.

One may add H. J. Holtzmann, "Höllenfahrt im N.T.," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XI (1908), 285-297; esp. 290ff. Also J. H. A. Hart, "The First Epistle General of Peter" in Vol. V of *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1910), p. 68; and Jean-Claude Margot, *Les Épîtres de Pierre* (Geneve: Editions Labor et Fides, 1960), p. 62.

2. Or, the 'spirits' may be assumed to be the 'fallen angels,' and Christ who preached to them is the pre-existent Christ, as Spitta suggests.[1]

3. The 'spirits' may be thought of as the spirits or the souls of the dead in general,[2] as is done by Chaine,[3] Michl,[4] Friedrich,[5] Lundberg[6] and Bultmann.[7]

4. The 'spirits in prison' may be a reference to the contemporaries of Noah who were destroyed by the Flood. That Noah and the Flood were the objects of widespread speculation among the people of the Jewish

---

[1] Spitta, Christi Predigt an die Geister . . ., pp. 21-22.

[2] For the history-of-concept parallels, see Knopf, Die Briefe Petri und Judä, p. 149.

[3] Chaine, "Descente du Christ aux Enfers," columns 418-419.

[4] Johann Michl, "Der erste Petrusbrief" in Vol. VIII of Das Neue Testament (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1953), p. 220. He also suggests the possibility that the 'spirits' might mean the 'fallen angels.' Cf. Reicke, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism., pp. 53-55.

[5] Friedrich in TWNT, III, 706.

[6] P. Lundberg, La Typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Eglise (Leipzig: A. Lorenz, 1942), pp. 107-108.

[7] Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," p. 5. As to the history-of-religion background of vs. 19, Bultmann is in agreement with H. Schlier (Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief, pp. 15ff.) in assuming that the framework of the Gnostic myth of the redeemer is adapted to denote the redeeming activity of Christ.

background is well attested in the related literature.[1] Scholars who are in favour of this identity are Bigg[2] and Schneider.[3]

5. The fifth view is a kind of compromise of the first and fourth; that is, the 'spirits' may be taken to mean both the 'fallen angels' and the disobedient contemporaries of Noah, with Windisch who thinks that, in the Petrine writer's mind, the 'fallen angels' and the disobedient people were combined.[4]

6. Or, the focus may be on the spirits or the souls of the righteous dead of the Old Dispensation, so Blenkin holds.[5]

---

[1] See Ezek. 14:19-20; Ecclesiasticus 44:17; I Enoch 65:1-67:3; Jubilee 6:15-16; 7:20-39; Test. Benj. 10; Iv Macc. 15:31. Cf. Matt. 24:37-39 (= Lk. 2:26-27; Heb. 11:7; II Ptr. 2:3.

With regard to the Rabbinic parallels, see Str.-Bill., I, 961-966.

[2] Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 162. Cf. pp. 162-163.

[3] J. Schneider, Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes (NTD, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), p. 83. Also C. E. B. Cranfield, "The Interpretation of I Peter iii. 19 and iv. 6," Exp.T., LXIX (1957-58), 370.

[4] Windisch-Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, p. 71. As we have noted above, Selwyn holds a similar view (The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 199).

[5] G. W. Blenkin, The First Epistle General of Peter (CGTSC; Cambridge: The University Press, 1914), p. 17. Blenkin refers to Heb. 12:13 for support. Cf. G. Wohlenberg, Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1915), pp. 105-115.

7. The 'spirits' may be a reference to demoniac beings. Bieder[1] and Daniélou[2] subscribe to this view.

8. Johnson follows Loisy in assuming that Christ preached both to the dead and to the imprisoned angels.[3]

A number of history-of-concept parallels and exegetical grounds for each view have been adduced by these scholars. We are not ready to make our own contribution to this particular area of discussion. Rather, we shall limit ourselves to the following comments:

First, one critical remark of ours which seems to pertain to most of these views is directed to the fact that, in an attempt to identify the history-of-concept parallel, an appeal is often made to 3:20 and 4: (5-)6 for support. However, vss. 3:20 and 4:6 are not to be regarded as having a direct bearing upon the history-of-concept identification of vs. 19 for two reasons. 1) As we have noted at the outset of this chapter, 3:20, along with vs. 21, belongs to the Petrine writer's redactoral addition.[4] 2) Then too, while there are notable linguistic, conceptual and structural correspondences between 3:18, 19, 22 and 4:1-6,[1] the latter passage appears to be a sort of epexegetical paraphrase of 3:18ff., also made by the writer.[2] In other words, while certain similarities of 3:19 and 3:20 together with 4:6 can be discussed as pertaining to the history-of-concept background of the Petrine writer himself,[3] the outcome of this consideration should not be projected into the history-of-concept study of vs. 19,[4] unless, of course, it can be verified that the history

---

[1] Werner Wieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949), pp. 112-113.

[2] Jean Daniélou, Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme (Tournai:Desclee & Co., 1958), p. 259.

[3] Sherman E. Johnson, "The Preaching to the Dead," JBL, LXXIX (1960), 48-51. Johnson's reference probably is made to Loisy, Remarques sur la littérature epistolaire du N.T., p. 130, which Selwyn mentions (The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 199).

[4] See pp. 305-360 . Cf. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," passim. The

---

character of vss. 20-21 as a redactoral addition seems to be assumed also by Bultmann.

[1] Cf. Boismard, *Quatre hymns baptismales dans la première Épître de Pierre*, pp. 63-65. Also Reicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism*, pp. 202-210.

[2] The similarities between 3:18ff. and 4:1-6 are limited to 3:18-19 and 4:1, 6. Differences between the two passages may, at least in part, be explained in terms of a more conscious adaptation of 3:18ff. into the hortatory context of the latter passage (see especially παθόντος for ἀπέθανεν, and the use of the phrase καὶ ὑμεῖς in 4:1). Cf. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, pp. 337-339.

[3] In this regard, the views held by Windisch and Selwyn (i.e., to suggest the possible combination of the 'fallen angels' and the contemporaries of Noah in the mind of the Petrine writer) seem to be closer to the true nature of the similarity between 3:19 and 3:20; 4:6.

[4] One fatal flaw in Bo Reick's well-informed monograph, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism*, is that, in his examination of 3:19 (and 3:18-22), he does not take a form-critical possibility concerning the passage into his consideration. His interpretation of it is based rather upon a history-of-concept observation and on syntactical and context-analytical observations; especially the last observation plays an important part in his study. Accordingly, from a viewpoint of 'analysis of traditional material,' as well as from

-of-concept background of vs. 19 happens to coincide with that of 3:20 and 4:6. But, since it seems precarious to assume this coincidence without making a proper inquiry into the matter, a history-of-concept study of vs. 19 should be carried out separately.

Secondly, while the history-of-concept parallel to the 'spirits in prison' is to be sought, after all, either in the 'fallen angels' or in the wicked contemporaries of Noah who perished in the Flood, the possibility of the third view listed above (i.e., 'spirits' = the spirits or the souls of the dead in general) may not be excluded.[1] Owing chiefly to the brevity of the

---

a history-of-tradition angle, his handling of the passage appears to be seriously limited.

[1] Pieces of evidence in favour of the identity of the 'spirits in prison' with the spirits of the dead in general may be listed as follows:

1. πνεύματα in Dan. 3:86 (LXX) appears to be a reference to the spirits of the dead. Cf. Heb. 12:23 (see Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, pp. 318-319). In addition, πνεύματα is used, along with ψυχαί, to denote the souls of the dead in I Enoch (I Enoch 9:3, 10; 102:4-5, 11; 103:3, 7-8. Sjöberg in *TWNT*, VI, 375, fn. 225 about the use of ψυχαί. For the use of πνεύματα just mentioned, see I Enoch 22:3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13; 103:4. Sjöberg, *ibid.*).

2. That the O.T. was acquainted with the speculation about the spirits of the dead, seems to be suggested by Isa. 8:19; 29:4. In the latter passage, אוב, which elsewhere means 'necromancer' (see Lev. 19:31; 20:6; Deut. 18:11; I Sam. 28:8ff.; 8:19; 19:3), denoted the spirits of the dead (B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* [*GHAT*, 4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922], p. 207.

3. In Rabbinic Judaism also that speculation was known (bBer 18b. Sjöberg, *op. cit.*, p. 375).

4. In the N.T. there are a few instances of πνεῦμα(τα) as signifying the spirits of the dead, or the dead

statement in vs. 19, however, it seems difficult to make any final decision on the history-of-concept parallel to the 'spirits' in this verse.

ii) Now we turn to the history-of-concept parallel to the 'prison,' the abode of the 'spirits.'

That the possible history-of-concept parallel to the 'spirits' may be sought either in the fallen angels or in the contemporaries of Noah or in the spirits of the dead in general, seems to accord with the fact that these parallel figures are associated with the ideas of imprisonment, binding with chains or the underworld realm as their abode. Let us survey them briefly.

Among the passages which attest the speculation about the fallen angels, the following passages appear to be particularly notable:

I Enoch 10:4-5:-

> "And again the Lord said to Raphael: 'Bind Azazel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness: and make an opening in the desert, which is in Dudael, and cast him therein. And place upon him rought and jagged rocks, and cover him with darkness,

---

(Lk. 24:37); Heb. 12:23).

In view of such instances, the contention made by Knopf, that πνεῦμα is not used to denote the dead (*Die Briefe Petri und Judä*, p. 149), seems unwarranted terminologically and from a history-of-concept point of view.

and let him abide there forever, and cover his face that he may not see light."[1]

I Enoch 10:12:-

"And when their sons have slain one another, and they have seen the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them fast for seventy generations in the valleys of the earth, till the day of their judgment and of their consummation, . . ."[2]

I Enoch 10:13:-

"In those days they shall be led off to the abyss of fire: (and) to the torment and the prison in which they shall be judged for ever."[3]

II Baruch 56:13:-

"And then those who did so[4] were tormented in chains."[5]

Jubilee 5:6:-

"And against the angels whom He had sent upon the earth, He was exceedingly wroth, and He gave commandment to root them out of

---

[1] E.t. by Charles in Charles, APOT, II, 193-194.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] This refers to the descent and mingling of the angels with women.

[5] E.t. by Charles, op. cit., p. 513.

> all their dominion, and He bade us to bind them in the depths of the earth, and behold they are bound in the midst of them, and are (kept) separate."[1]

Among the numerous parallels to show the prevalence of speculation about the contemporaries of Noah in Rabbinic circles,[2] there is only one reference to Gehinnom as a place of punishment (R. Johanan, d. 279. Gen. R.28--18a--).[3]

In addition, we find a number of references to Sheol and Gehinnom in the O.T.-Jewish literature as the abode of the spirits of the dead or the dead in general, or the place of penal confinement of the sinful dead.[4]

---

[1] E.t. by Charles in Charles, *APOT*, II, 20.

[2] See Str.-Bill., I, 961-966. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 966.

[4] For the details, see Str.-Bill., IV (part 2), 1016-1165. Also Charles in Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 230 (a footnote on Sheol).

Φυλακή in the sense of an 'abode of the dead' seems unparalleled in the N.T. Only two comparable cases may be found in Rev. 18:2 and 20:7.

1. In Rev. 20:7, φυλακή is a place of penal confinement for Satan until the millenium is ended. If πνεύματα were identical with Satan, we would have, in Rev. 20:7, a mythical imagery corresponding to a similar construction in the Petrine passage. But such an identity seems unlikely, primarily due to the fact that an apocalyptic temporal frame of reference is absent from the Petrine passage.

2. Φυλακή in Rev. 18:2, especially its first instance (φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου), is different from the expression in 20:7. The immediate context of 18:2 lacks a mythical frame of reference. Instead, φυλακή in 18:2 is poetic, and describes the corrupted state of 'Babylon' (cf. a parallel phrase φυλακὴ παντὸς ὀρνέου ἀκαθάρτου).

These instances in Revelation do not correspond to φυλακή in I Ptr. 3:19.

Again, owing to the brevity of the expression 'the spirits in prison,' it is not clear whether φυλακή means a (preliminary or) permanent place of punishment or a temporary abode of the dead between the death and the resurrection.

Now, if one may conjecture, not without relevant reasons, that 3:19 is formulated as a contrast to the figure of Enoch (who is represented, e.g., in I Enoch 17-36 as a proclaimer of doom to the fallen angels in Sheol), this line of understanding would elucidate, first, the complex problem of the history-of-concept identity of the 'spirits' and the 'prison,' and secondly, the manner of adaptation (as carried out by the early Church) of the traditional Jewish conceptual framework. This emphasized the all-inclusive saving efficacy of Jesus Christ, with a more or less explicit kerygmatic-apologetic intention,[1] to which the motif of theodicy might also have been contributive.[2] We can present this view only as one possible, tentative solution of the history-of-concept problems related to 3:19. The limited scope of this verse will not, so it seems, permit us to find any more decisive solution.

---

[1] Cf. Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi, pp. 200-202. Also pp. 128-129.

[2] Cf. M. Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind" in Vol. I of Botschaft und Geschichte (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), p. 37.

ii) Now, let us turn to possible N.T. allusions to the idea formulated in 3:19.

In one of the few comprehensive studies on the subject, Bieder lists the following passages as possible allusions to the descent of Christ: Mk. 3:27 (= Matt. 12:29); Matt. 12:40; 16:18; 27:51b-53; Mk. 16:4 (variant reading); Lk. 23:42-43; Acts 2:24-31; Rom. 6:3ff.; 10:7; 14:9; Col. 2:14-15; Phil. 2:10; Eph. 4:8-10; Heb. 2:14; 13:20 (and other passages in Hebrews); Rev. 1:18, along with I Ptr. 3:18-20. Bieder's interest appears to be in inquiring into the use of the general theme of 'transitory descent of Jesus into hell' in these passages;[1] he does not ask possible history-of-tradition relations among these parallel passages. We shall limit ourselves to examining the view held by Foster. He ascribes a high degree of probability (a-b) to a direct literary dependence of I Ptr. 3:19 upon Eph. 4:9.[2]

---

[1] Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi, pp. 32-129. See a concluding remark on p. 128.

On Acts 2:24-31, for instance, see Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 29: "Für die Vorstellung einer Hadesfahrt ist die Stelle nicht auszuwerten; Lk. kennt diese Vorstellung nicht, und ein vorlukanischer Sinn ist nicht zu erschliessen." See W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge: The University Press, 1939), pp. 220-226. Knox's succinct survey includes relevant history-of-religion (--history-of-concept) observations.

[2] Foster, The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," p. 445.

The parallel passages set out by Foster are as follows:

I Ptr. 3:19	Eph. 4:9
τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν.	κατέβη (πρῶτον)[1] εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς . (he . . . descended into the lower parts of the earth.)

Foster's comments on these allegedly parallel passages may be outlined as follows:

1. What Paul meant by the descent is Christ's coming down to the 'present world' from heaven.

2. The pre-Christian form of the idea of the 'harrowing of hell' probably goes back to Isa. 26:12-19. Christians took over this idea without altering it substantially.

3. Eph. 4:9 "marks the transition point"; from this verse the Petrine writer "apparently drew the doctrine of the mission of Christ to the underworld. The more developed form found in I Peter indicates the priority of Paul."

Despite Büchsel's attempt to prove that the verse in Ephesians is a reference to the descent of Christ into the underworld,[2] Foster's first point, as outlined above, seems basically true;[1] this view has found strong advocates in Bieder,[2] and Schlier.[3] Foster's second point as to the history-of-concept background may be set aside from our present consideration.[4] Foster's third point is what gives us most concern: is it possible to assume with Foster that I Ptr. 3:19 is derived from, and has developed, Eph. 4:9?

---

[1] This word is omitted in p^{46} 𝔥 D G I^{vid}. B 𝔎 pl lat retain it.

[2] Büchsel in TWNT, III, 641-643.

The following points show the difficulties with Foster's view:

1. One of the problematical points is already latent in his view of Eph. 4:9 as a reference to Christ's coming down upon earth: this Ephesians passage is different from the Petrine passage, since the latter refers to the descent of Christ to the abode of the spirits. In order to follow Foster, we must assume either that the one who formulated the Christological credal formula, as represented in I Ptr. 3:18ff.,

---

[1] Abbott precedes Foster in maintaining the view (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897 , pp. 114-115).

[2] Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi, pp. 81-90. Cf. H. Rendtorff, "Der Brief an die Epheser," Vol. VIII (NTD, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), p. 75.

[3] Schlier, Der Brief and die Epheser, p. 192. As a possible conceptual milieu for the theme of the descent and ascension of a redeemer, Schlier suggests a Gnostic one, which is paralleled in the Fourth Gospel (3:13, et al.).

[4] In passing it may be noted that his list of history-of-concept parallels is unjustifiably limited.

mistook the reference to the incarnation in Eph. 4:9 for a remark about the descent into the underworld, or that he read the notion of 'the descent into the underworld' into the verb καταβαίνω . Is this a plausible view? Since there is no thematic unity between the two passages concerned, one cannot regard the alleged modification in the Petrine passage as a developed form of Eph. 4:9 as Foster thinks.[1]

---

[1] A similarly critical remark may be made against Bultmann's view of the motif of *imitatio Christi* as represented in I Ptr. 2:21ff.; 3:18. Bultmann maintains that the Petrine motif of *imitatio Christi* is a modification of the Pauline notion of suffering and death with Christ (*Theologie des N.Ts.*, p. 532). That is, the Petrine motif has lost the element of κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων (Χριστοῦ), which was understood by Paul as an "inner (i.e., versus '*historische*') union with Christ which is accomplished in faith" (*ibid.*, p. 352. Cf. II Cor. 4:10f. Also I Cor. 12:25f.; Gal. 6:17). Bultmann's view finds its precursor in Eva Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche* (Beihefte zur *ZNW*, 18; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1937), p. 11. Cf. pp. 10-13.

We now have a succinct and yet very weighty article by Anselm Schulz, O.S.B., entitled "Leidenstheologie und Vorbildethik in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen" in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, Josef Schmid--Festschrift (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), pp. 265-269. Schulz's study is directed against an indiscriminatory application of the theme of *imitatio Christi* both to the *leidenstheologische Texte* and to the *Zeugnisse der Vorbildethik* as represented in the major epistles of Paul.

According to Schulz's analysis, the interpretative principle underlying the Pauline *leidenstheologische Texte* is the O.T.-Rabbinic notion of 'corporate personality,' and this is regarded also as underlying Paul's sacramental and eschatological trains of thought; with the aid of this principle Paul presents the structure of the Christ-event in his own existence (p. 268). The differences between the *leidenstheologische Texte* and the *Zeugnisse der Vorbildethik* are noted on the two following points:

1. The former is exclusively Christo-centric; the

2. If the one who formulated the credal piece could take the καταβαίνω of Eph. 4:9 as a reference to the descent into the underworld, we must presume that he had already become so familiar with the idea of descent that he would easily associate the verb with this idea. Then although one can assume a sort of literary acquaintance of I Ptr. 3:19 with Eph. 4:9, a more original history-of-tradition background for the Petrine passage is to be looked for outside the Ephesians context.[1]

---

latter appeals not only to the example of Christ as a motive for the moral conduct of Christians, but also to the exemplary conduct of Paul himself and of other Christians (p. 268).

2. The former is genuinely Paul's own material; with regard to the latter, Paul himself is indebted to the use of the example of Christ in the primitive Christian tradition (p. 269). In relation with this second point, Schulz refers to Mk. 10:45; Lk. 22:27; Jn. 13:34; I Jn. 3:16; I Ptr. 2:21; 3:18; Heb. 12:2f.

In Schulz's view, while the *Vorbildzeugnisse* in Paul's major epistles are of a parenetic nature, the *leidenstheologische Texte* are primarily religious assertions and are free from moral obligation (p. 269). Although, in the realm of Biblical faith, religion and ethics are closely related to each other, their different structure is not to be overlooked (p. 269).

Two texts in I Peter (2:21; 4:12-14), the closeness of which to the Pauline epistles is widely maintained, do conclusively illustrate, so Schulz thinks, the difference between *Leidenstheologie* and *Vorbildethik* (p. 269).

With reference to the views held by Bultmann and Aleith, at least three relevant points are made, so we infer, by Schulz: first, Paul's major epistles also contain a few *Zeugnisse der Vorbildethik*; secondly, these passages and the *leidenstheologische Texte* are markedly different from each other as to the nature and structure of reference; thirdly, with regard to the use of the *Zeugnisse der Vorbildethik* Paul is dependent upon parenetic tradition of the primitive Church. These points seem pertinent enough to caution anyone against interpreting the motif of *imitatio Christi* in I Peter in terms of a modification of *Paul's Leidenstheologie*.

[1] In this regard, those N.T. passages which seem to allude explicitly or implicitly to the so-called 'transitorische Hadesaufenthalt Jesu,' in Bieder's terms, are

(If the reference to the preaching of Christ to the 'spirits in prison' were present in the Ephesians passage, and καταβαίνω in the Petrine passage, then the use of καταβαίνω in the latter passage could be explained as a summary or a condensed form of the reference. Since, however, the case is otherwise, the history-of-tradition dependence of the Petrine passage upon Eph. 4:9 cannot easily be substantiated.)

Therefore, though we do note the similarity between the two passages in their sharing of the antithetical motif of descending--ascending, we cannot accept Foster's explanation of this similarity.

The outcome of our study in A (c) may be outlined as follows:

1. The history-of-concept identity of the 'spirits in prison' and the history-of-concept parallel of the descent and preaching of a redeemer are very vexing problems. One possibility is to conjecture that I Ptr. 3:19 might have been formulated in contrast to the figure of Enoch as represented in I Enoch 17-36.

2. It is difficult to prove the alleged (history-of-tradition) dependence of I Ptr. 3:19 upon Eph. 4:9.

---

to be taken into consideration (see Bieder, _Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi_, pp. 32-129).

B. We shall go on to examine the second half of the Christological credal piece (I Ptr. 3:22), as we have reconstructed it. This passage is divided into three lines, and these lines represent, respectively, a) the theme of Christ seated at the right hand of God (hereafter 'session'),[1] b) His ascension, and c) the subjugation to Him of the cosmic powers. While the lines are not arranged in a strictly chronological order, in contrast to the first half of this credal piece, they represent the general theme of the exaltation of Christ.

In this sub-section, we shall limit ourselves to an examination of the first line of the second half of the credal piece under consideration.[2]

---

[1] The phrase 'Heavenly Session' is employed in this sense by Selwyn (The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 206). The term 'session' seems to have been derived from the Latin phrase *sessio ad dexteram*.

[2] Our separate examination of the first line may be justified in part by the fact that the three themes do not always appear as a unit. See the following:

1. The explicit references to the session may be classified as follows:
   - (i) the death--the resurrection--the session
     Rom. 8:34
   - (ii) the resurrection--the session
     Acts 2:32-33
   - (iii) the resurrection--the session--the subjugation Eph. 1:20-21
   - (iv) the session--the *endzeitliche* appearance
     Mk. 14:62 (= Matt. 26:64); Col. 3:1, 3.
     Cf. Heb. 9:28
   - (v) the death--the session
     Heb. 1:3; 10:12; 12:2
   - (vi) the session *per se*
     Acts 7:55; Heb. 8:1. Cf. Rev. 12:5b
   - (vii) the ascension--the session--the subjugation
     I Ptr. 3:22

2. Among the explicit references to the ascension, the single instance which combines the ascension with

The first line (I Ptr. 3:22a), with which we are concerned at present, reads as follows:

ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ.

(who is at the right hand of God)

Scholars as Foster, Barnett, and Mitton have maintained the direct literary dependence of this line upon Rom. 8:34, Eph. 1:20(19-21) or Col. 3:1. Let us first inquire into the alleged parallel between Rom. 8:34 and the Petrine line. Our elucidation of this parallel passage will have a bearing upon the history-of-tradition consideration of the remaining (deutero-) Pauline passages.

a) The text of Rom. 8:34 is as follows:

τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν ;
Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς [1] ὁ ἀποθανών ,

---

the session is found in Mk. 16:19b. As regards the non-Markan character of Mk. 16:19-20, see Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 613, W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Markus (THNT, 1962), p. 328, and E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, p. 363.

The imagery of Christ's entering a sanctuary or heaven as we find it in Heb. 9:24, seems to be a figurative reference to His vicarious death (cf. Heb. 9:28). Cf. Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, pp. 213-214.

3. In Phil. 2:10, the theme of exaltation absorbs both the resurrection and the session. An instance similar to this may be found in I Tim. 3:16.

[1] Ἰησοῦς is omitted in B ℜ D al sy. Ἰησοῦς is retained in ℌ G L pm vg.

μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς ,[1]
ὅς ἐστιν[2] ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ,
ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν .
(Who is to condemn?
Is it Christ Jesus, who died,
yes, who was raised (from the dead),[3]
who is at the right hand of God,
who indeed intercedes for us? RSV)[4]

Within the larger unit of Rom. 8:31-39, vs. 34 constitutes, along with vs. 33, a bipartite unit;[5] and this verse by itself forms an independent Christological statement. The three Christological references in this verse somewhat awkward from a context-analytical point of view, are not necessitated in the given context, since the combination of Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς and ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν makes perfect sense; rather these references serve here only as emphatic modifiers of Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς , and represent in themselves an aporia so far as the flow of thought is concerned.

---

[1] The phrase ἐκ νεκρῶν is added to ἐγερθείς in ℌ pc. This phrase is omitted in p27 vid p46 B D G pl lat sy.

[2] Ἔστιν is preceded by καί in p27 p46 BℜD G pm it. Καί is omitted in ℌ al d* vg.

[3] We parenthesize this phrase, while retaining it in accordance with the RSV text. See footnote 2 for the textual variation.

[4] In contrast to the RSV translation, this passage can well be translated into an affirmative sentence.

[5] Cf. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 186.

There are some features which suggest the 'formulary' character of vs. 34:

1. the use of participles which modify Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς (ἀποθανών, ἐγερθείς).[1]

2. the use of the relative pronoun ὅς, the antecedent of which also is Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.[2]

3. the 'meaningfully divided' four-line structure.[3]

4. an instance of homoiokatarkton in the third and fourth lines (note the use of ὅς).

5. a possible instance of antithetical parallelism in the use of ἀποθανών and ἐγερθείς; the use of μᾶλλον being indicative of this parallelism.[4]

6. numerous parallel instances to the first three lines of Christological reference elsewhere in the N.T.[5]

---

[1] Cf. Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions, p. 140.

[2] Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 186.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

[5] The following parallel passages may be noted:
1. on the death of Christ: Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 8:3; I Cor. 8:11; 15:3; I Thess. 5:10.
2. on the resurrection: Rom. 1:5; 4:24; 8:11; I Cor. 15:4-5; Gal. 1:1.
3. on the session: Mk. 14:62 (= Matt. 26:64); Acts 2:33; 7:55. Cf. Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3; 10:12; 12:2.

In view of these features, it seems that a traditional, Christological formulary piece is reflected in vs. 34.[1]

Now, as to the pre-Pauline character of the references to the death and resurrection, it will suffice for our present concern to refer to I Cor. 15:3ff.[2] What concerns us most here is the history-of-tradition place of the reference to the session in the Romans passage. The pre-Pauline character of this reference seems to be already suggested by its incorporation as part of the formulary credal piece in vs. 34; but more conspicuously, the parallel instances in Mk. 14:62 and Acts 2:33 (see also Acts 7:55) appear to point to the pre-Pauline origin. This leads us to the examination of Mk. 14:62; Acts 2:33, and in connection with Mk. 14:62, Mk. 12:35-37.

i) In Mk. 14:62, we find a statement made by Jesus as a reply to the high priest, who asked Jesus whether he was 'Christ and the Son of the Blessed':

---

[1] Similar views have been expressed by C. H. Dodd (The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (MNTC; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932 , pp. 144-145), Michel (Der Brief an die Römer, p. 186), H. W. Schmidt (Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer THNT; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962 , pp. 153-154) and Neufeld (The Earliest Christian Confessions, pp. 140 and 142).

[2] See Ernst Lichtenstein, "Die älteste christliche Glaubensformel," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte LXIII (1950), 1-74. Also Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 129-131.

> "I am; and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." (RSV)

In this passage there seem to be clear echoes of Ps. 109:1 (LXX) and Dan. 7:13; that is, we have here, in Hahn's terms, an instance of 'blending of the idea of a royal Messiahship and that of the Son of man."[1] This passage by nature evokes a vexing question of authenticity. Taylor, for instance, maintains that Mk. 14:53-65 is "an account based on tradition,"[2] and comes out with an affirmative position on Mk. 14:62, after a critical survey of the previous views.[3] He does not exclude the possibility that this verse may reflect, along with Mk. 8:38 and 13:26, "the apocalyptic hopes of the Church,"[4] but he asserts, "As the foundation of this development, it is every way probable that in reply to the high priest's challenge Jesus spoke of His triumph substantially as is recorded by Mark."[5] Bornkamm's brief remark on Mk. 14:62 stands in sharp contrast to Taylor's view; in Bornkamm's opinion, Jesus' reply in this Marcan verse and the confession made by

---

[1] Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, p. 128.

[2] Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 563.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 564 and 568-569. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 569.

[5] Taylor, *loc. cit.* Cf. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, pp. 111-114; esp. 113.

Peter in Matt. 16:17 are "deutliche Wiederspiegelung des Christusbekenntnisses der späteren Gemeinde."[1] Among the more recent studies related to Mk. 14:62, the ones carried out by Grässer[2] and Hahn[3] are remarkable. Grässer, who follows the suggestion made by Bultmann,[4] notes the order of the session and the coming of Christ, which is a reversal of the order found, for instance, in Matt. 25:31; Mk. 8:38. Behind the combination of Ps. 110:1 and Dan. 7:13 Grässer sees an underlying theological intention; i.e., to emphasize the presence of an interim period between the death and the second coming of Christ. While there is no piece of evidence for the fact that, in the preaching of Jesus, He either assumed this interim period or regarded the exaltatio ad dexteram and the second coming as one, at any rate the primitive Church seems to have differentiated, at first, sessio ad dexteram and the second coming, and later, exaltatio, sessio and the second coming. The beginning of this differentiation is represented, so Grässer thinks, in Mk. 14:62; or what we have in this Marcan verse is, in his view, the "Glaubensaussagen about the Son of man most familiar in the primitive Church."[1] In short, Grässer takes this Marcan passage as an instance of the primitive Christian apology concerning the delay of the parousia.[2]

---

[1] Günther Bornkamm, Jesus von Nazareth (3rd ed.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1959), p. 160.

[2] Erich Grässer, Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte (Beihefte zur ZNW, 22; 2nd ed.; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), esp. pp. 172-177.

[3] Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, pp. 126-132 (Exkurs II: "Psalm 110, 1 und die Anschauung von der Erhöhung Jesu").

[4] Grässer sums up Bultmann's suggestion as follows: ". . . die erste Frage nicht die sein darf, was geschichtlich denkbar sei, sondern was aus christlicher Gemeindetradition verständlich sei." (A reference is made to Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, p. 291.)

In Hahn's view, first, Grässer has not perceived clearly the concept of exaltation of the earlier assertions of the parousia; secondly, Grässer's treatment is limited to Mk. 14:62; and thirdly, the central significance of Ps. 110:1 has not been recognized.[3] Hahn regards Mk. 14:61-62 as an indication of the fact that the theme of the session, conceived in an endzeitliche frame of reference, played a role in the 'old Palestinian tradition,'[4] and thus far, Hahn seems to agree with

---

[1] Grässer, Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung . . ., pp. 174-175.

[2] Ibid., pp. 177-178.

[3] Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 129, fn. 1.

[4] Hahn thinks that the idea of the heavenly activity of Christ is not formulated in the old Palestinian church (see ibid., pp. 95ff.); he also maintains that the so-called 'eschatological use of the motif of the session at the right hand of God,' as represented in Mk. 14:61-62, is found nowhere else in the N.T. (ibid., p. 128). To the latter remark we shall return presently.

Grässer. Now, Hahn sees a sort of cleavage between the idea represented in Mk. 14:61-62 and the one entertained by the 'early Hellenistic Jewish Christian church, which related the session to the motif of exaltation; Christ is regarded by this church as the exalted One who exercises His Lordship;[1] and in Hahn's view, as to the ascription of the function and the title of κύριος , the introductory part of Ps. 110:1 was contributive.[2] The motif of exaltation which underlies this view of Christ presupposes, so Hahn thinks, a 'profound alteration of eschatology,' caused by the experience of the delay of the parousia.[3] The formulation of the motif of exaltation results in repressing the eschatological expectation, and as is exhibited in some instances,[4] the resurrection loses its point of reference or is absorbed into the motif of exaltation.[5]

The views held by Grässer and Hahn seem to be suggestive attempts to see Mk. 14:62 against a coherent history-of-thought background in the early Church, to which the problem of the delay of parousia might have been a major concern. Since Grässer's view has been subjected to Hahn's pertinent critical remarks, we shall limit our own criticisms to the following observations about Hahn's study:

---

[1] Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 129.

[2] Ibid., pp. 131-132. [3] Ibid., p. 129; see p. 132.

[4] Cf. Phil. 2:9ff.; I Tim. 3:16; I Ptr. 3:18; Heb. 1:4; 2:9-10; 10:12; 12:2; Jn. 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34. Ibid., p. 130, fn. 3.

[5] See Rom. 8:34. There the resurrection is distinguished from the session.

1. Hahn seems to have made a too widely applicable concept out of 'exaltation,' partly neglecting the figurative character of this term. When he says that in Mk. 14:62 the session is combined with the 'exaltation,' the alleged combination is not demonstrastrably clear. The idea of exaltation is integral to both the ascension and the session. Its figurative (-descriptive) character seems evident, first, when the verb ὑψόω is used, e.g., in Acts 2:33 (τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς . See also Acts 5:31), and secondly, when the notion appears in a highly stylized passage, where it becomes an antithetical parallel to humiliation (Phil. 2:10. Cf. I Tim. 3:16).[1]

2. An embarrassing piece of evidence against Hahn's neat schematization, especially against his remark that the endzeitliche session is paralleled nowhere else in the N.T.,[2] is found in Col. 3:1, 3. In this passage the session is mentioned along with the endzeitliche appearance of Christ. Neither Hahn nor Grässer has elucidated the history-of-tradition place of this Colossians passage. If the deutero-Pauline

---

[1] See Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus (2nd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1961), pp. 48-49.

[2] Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 128.

character of Colossians is to be assumed, the problematical character of this passage appears to be enhanced even further, since one would then have to presume the continuation of an *endzeitliche* view of the session and of the *parousia* as one of the immediate theological strata of deutero-Pauline circles. How does Hahn (and Grässer) explain this?

3. If, with (Grässer and) Hahn, one takes it as a premise that the delay of the *parousia* was one of the major concerns of the early Church, the (independent) use of the motif of exaltation may be considered indicative of that theological situation, since admittedly, 'exaltation' may well be supposed to pertain to the interim period between Christ's death and the *parousia*. However, an objection may be made against this view by saying that the ascension and the session, which are regarded by Hahn as having been combined with the 'exaltation' (in the early Hellenistic Jewish Christian church), are originally and primarily integral to the belief in the *parousia*. We have already pointed out that the motif of exaltation has been loosely used by Hahn. How does he restrain himself from reading the above-mentioned premise into the 'exaltation,' or from distorting the original and primary association of the 'ascension--session' with the *parousia*?

When these considerations are brought together, it appears that Hahn's view is not necessarily convincing. One may agree with him, as well as with Grässer, in regarding Mk. 14:(61-) 62 as reflecting a view held by the primitive Church, but it appears to be difficult to take the 'session' with reference to the problem of the delay of the parousia.

ii) Is it possible to go further to elucidate the history-of-tradition origin of the 'session' which we find in Mk. 14:62? It appears to be possible, by bringing Mk. 12:36 (= Matt. 22:44) into our consideration. The relevant passage, Mk. 12:35-37, reads as follows:

> "And as Jesus taught in the temple, he said, 'How can the scribes say that the Christ is the son of David? David himself, inspired by the Holy Spirit, declared,
>
> The Lord said to my Lord,
> Sit at my right hand,
> till I put thy enemies under thy feet.
>
> David himself calls him Lord; so how is he his son?' And the great throng heard him gladly." (RSV)

This is one of a very few passages which quotes Ps. 109:1 (LXX).[1] Since the phrasing about the session is found, e.g., in I Ptr. 3:22, is quite probably an echo of this Psalm passage, and since this Marcan pericope is concerned with the Lordship of the Messiah (versus his being the son of David), this pericope needs to be scrutinized.

---

[1] Remaining two instances are found in Acts 2:34b-35 and Heb. 1:13.

Mk. 12:35-37 comprises an independent unit, in which Jesus is said to have taken issue with the scribal understanding of the Messiah, i.e., that he is to be the son of David.[1] Jesus rejects this view by appealing to the statement made by David himself. This pericope again invites the complex question of authenticity. Bultmann, for instance, contends that this Marcan passage is a product of the Church (eine Gemeindebildung),[2] since the view that the Messiah could not be the son of David, would not have had any significance for Jesus. If Jesus has regarded Himself as the Messiah, there are, so Bultmann suggests, two possibilities, i.e., either He knew Himself as the son of David or as the Son of man. In Bultmann's view, however, there is no piece of evidence available to confirm either one of these two possibilities. Thus Marcan pericope is the 'community product' either of (a section of) the primitive Church, which wanted to represent the contrast of the belief of the Son of man to that of the son of David, or of the Hellenistic church which intended to prove that Jesus was more than the son of David, that is, the Son of God.[1] Fuller, who has considerably modified the view he originally held in his The Mission and Achievement of Jesus,[2] now maintains as follows with regard to the Marcan passage:[3]

---

[1] For the Rabbinic interpretation of Ps. 110:1ff., see Str.-Bill., IV (part 1), 452-465.

[2] R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), p. 145. Cf. p. 70.

> . . .It is more likely a reflection of the debates of the early church. Note too that it is based on the LXX text. It is therefore more likely to be of Hellenistic Jewish Christian provenance.

However, against these views the following points may be noted:

1. With reference to the first two possibilities suggested by Bultmann (and against those who take this Marcan passage as pertaining to the Messianic consciousness of Jesus), it seems important to note that this pericope is concerned solely, in a rather detached manner, with the issue of the Davidic descent of the Messiah, and there is nothing to suggest, at least explicitly, that Jesus' argument had anything to do with His own Messianic claim. Bultmann's view seems to have been led by a wrong Fragestellung, and accordingly, the two alternatives suggested by him appear to be irrelevant.

---

[1] Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, pp. 145-146. In part I tried to render close to the original.

[2] Reginald H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (SBT; Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1956), p. 113: ". . .The situation presupposed by the dialogue and character of its language are wholly compatible with a context in the ministry of Jesus."

[3] Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of N.T. Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 111. Cf. pp. 188-191.

As to the literary character of this pericope, one may point out that, first, there is no piece of descriptive statement about the circumstance which prompted Jesus' argument, and secondly, there is no literary embellishment to make the statement by Jesus into an assertion of His Messiahship. It is possible to take the absence of circumstantial description and in fact the incorporation of this pericope into the present context as reflecting the implicit intention of the early Church or the Marcan writer to uphold the Lordship--Messiahship. All the same, this interpretation is yet to be demonstrated;[1] nevertheless, this consideration is secondary to the neutral character of the contents of the argument presented by Jesus.[2]

2. As to an alleged Hellenistic Jewish Christian origin, Fuller refers to the use of the LXX text. We do think that if the divergence between the Hebrew text and the LXX text is conspicuous enough to suggest a conscious, theological alteration on the side of the one who quotes the LXX text, one can, and has to, take the divergence as indicative of the community theology of Hellenistic Jewish Christians or the writer himself.

---

[1] Kurt Schubert suggests, for instance, that this Marcan pericope is understandable against the background of the Messianic view entertained in the Qumran community (Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer [München/Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1958], p. 121).

[2] For supplementary considerations directed against Bultmann, see Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, pp. 491-493.

However, the mere use of the LXX text cannot by itself be regarded as suggesting the alleged Hellenistic Jewish Christian origin, since for the Marcan writer, who writes in Greek, to quote the Hebrew text verbatim or to transliterate it would not have been a practical literary procedure. So far as the quotation in the Marcan pericope is concerned, there appears to be no change significant enough to suggest reflection of the theology of the Hellenistic Jewish Christian church.[1]

In view of these two problems as regards the views against the authenticity of Mk. 12:35-37, one may regard this pericope as reflecting possibly a saying of Jesus. This seems to imply that the original use of Ps. 110:1, which is echoed in Mk. 14:62, might possibly have originated with Jesus Himself. Now, while Mk. 12:35-37 is centered around the introductory part of the Psalm passage ("The Lord said unto my Lord"), Mk. 14:62 is about the heavenly session of Jesus. It seems that the difference in application of Ps. 110:1 may be attributed largely to the different occasions; this difference is not remarkable enough to raise a question about the possible origins of these applications. As a matter of course, our consideration rests upon the possibility of the authenticity of Mk. 12:35-37.[1] But if this line of consideration is plausible, the possibility of tracing Mk. 14:62 back to the primitive Christian milieu of tradition, as we have suggested elsewhere, seems to be enhanced.

---

[1] Cf. H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen (2nd ed.; Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), pp. 753 and 756-758. Also E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), p. 262, fn. 2.

ii) Essentially the same history-of-tradition observation (i.e., a possible derivation of the reference to the session from the primitive Christian tradition) may be made about Acts 2:33.[2] That Luke utilized a piece of traditional material in this passage,[3] seems to be suggested at least in part by the fact that the idea of the session which is regarded here as underscoring the Lordship and Messiahship of Christ, is extraneous to Luke's theology.[4]

In view of these history-of tradition observations about Mk. 14:62; 12:35-37 and Acts 2:33, one may conclude that, in Rom. 8:34, a piece of pre-Pauline tradition about the session seems to be reflected.

---

[1] If this possibility can be upheld, a remark made by Lohmeyer becomes relevant: "Er ist geschichtlich wichtig, weil er damit bezeugt, dass κύριος ein andere Name für Messias war." (Das Evangelium des Markus, p. 262, fn. 3).

[2] Cf. Acts 5:31. On Acts 7:55, see Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, pp. 50-51. Also E. Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte (KEK, 11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 249-258.

[3] Haenchen, ibid., p. 155. Cf. Conzelmann, op. cit. p. 30.

[4] See Lk. 2:40ff.; 3:22; 4:18; 9:35 (Haenchen, ibid.)

Now, as to an alleged direct literary relationship of Rom. 8:34 to I Ptr. 3:22, our judgment will rest primarily upon the literary-critical observations of terminology and syntax, since we have already noted the traditional-formulary character of the two passages, Rom. 8:34 and I Ptr. 3:18, 19, 22, and especially the pre-Pauline character of the reference to the session.

So far as the references to the session are concerned, the Romans passage and the Petrine passage coincide verbatim, and this coincidence is particularly notable because of the fact that only these two passages translate the original imperative sentence into a relative clause (ὅς ἐστιν κτλ .).[1] When we turn to a larger context (i.e., Christological references in Rom. 8:34; I Ptr. 3:18, 19, 22), while there are certain terminological and structural affinities,[2] one conspicuous difference is in the fact that a reference to the resurrection (which is emphasized in Rom. 8:34: μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς) is absent from the Petrine passage. The latter passage further differs from the former in its addition of an adverbial phrase περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν , the ἵνα-clause, the reference to Jesus' preaching to the

---

[1] This feature is noted by Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 130, fn. 1.

[2] The use of ἀποθνήσκω in Rom. 8:34 and I Ptr. 3: 18 is to be noted. The references to the death and the session are mentioned in both passages.

'spirits in prison,' and the references to the ascension and the subjugation.

When we bring together these differences and our foregoing observations, it seems difficult to assume the existence of a direct literary relationship; certain similarities shared by these two passages are to be attributed, so it seems, to the fact that they drew (probably independently from each other) upon the traditional Christological formula(e) current in the early Church.

b) With regard to the possible relationship of I Ptr. 3:22 to Eph. 1:20 or to Col. 3:1, our history-of-tradition consideration of the parallel between the Petrine passage and Rom. 8:34 seems to pertain here also, since, so far as the reference to the session is concerned, first, there is no substantial difference between Rom. 8:34 and Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1, and secondly, there is nothing to suggest that I Ptr. 3:22a and the (deutero-)Pauline passages represent different history-of-tradition material. But the second point is complicated by the fact that, Eph. 1:20 is of a 'formulary' character,[1] and Col. 3:1 is part of a passage (Col. 3:

---

[1] So Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon*, pp. 64-65. The use of participial construction (i.e., ἐγείρας and καθίσας in vs. 20) and a relative pronoun ἣν (vs. 20), the antecedent of which is τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ (vs. 19), may be noted.

1-3) which appears to contain sporadic credal remarks;[1] especially the combination of the session and the *endzeitliche* appearance which we find in Col. 3:1, 3 is, as we have noted above,[2] the same as we find in Mk. 14:62. Therefore, the possibility of a direct literary relationship of I Ptr. 3:22a to Eph. 1:20(-21) or to Col. 3:1(,3) is to be tested on the basis of a comparative examination of the literary features of the immediate contexts of the relevant passages (e.g., terminology and structure of Christological references). Examination shows this possibility to be unwarranted, particularly because of the different types of references made to the session.[3] A certain correspondence which we find between I Ptr. 3:22a and Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1, especially with reference to the session, is to be

---

[1] See the following: ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος, vs. 1; ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, vs. 3. The conjunctive clause εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ may well be taken as an indirect reference to the resurrection; συνεγείρω seems to carry here, as elsewhere (Eph. 2:6; Col. 2:12), a baptismal connotation. Cf. Lohmeyer, "Σὺν Χριστῷ" in *Festgabe für Adolf Deismann* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1927), pp. 218-257).

[2] See p. 384.

[3] See the *following*:

1. the resurrection--the session--the subjugation
   Eph. 1:20-21
2. the session--the *endzeitliche* appearance
   Col. 3:1, 3
3. the ascension--the session--the subjugation
   I Ptr. 3:22

It may be noted that no direct reference is made either to the resurrection or to the *endzeitliche* appearance in the Christological credal piece which we have in I Ptr. 3:18, 19, 22. The fact that no explicit mention attributed to the fact that they all drew upon the same (or similar) traditional Christological credal formulation(s) current in the early Church.

The outcome of our study in sub-section B may be outlined as follows:

1. I Ptr. 3:22a is apparently an echo of Ps. 109:1 (LXX). This reference to the session appears to have been derived from an old Palestinian Christian tradition, with a possibility that the use of this Psalm passage to denote the session originated in a saying of Jesus as represented in Mk. 14:62 (see Mk. 12:35-37; Acts 2:33-35).

2. The alleged direct literary dependence of I Ptr. 3:22a upon Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1 seems unwarranted. The affinity displayed by these verses is to be attributed to their common dependence upon the traditional Christological (credal) formulation(s) current in the early Church.

---

is made of the ascension in the Pauline (deutero Pauline) epistles is even more conspicuous (only in Lk. 24:51; Mk. 16:19b; Acts 1:9, besides I Ptr. 3:22).

CHAPTER VIII

DOXOLOGICAL FORMULAE AND AMEN IN 4:11d; 5:11

It seems that we have a doxology in 4:11, and a variant of it in 5:11.[1] Because there is some degree of difference between the two passages, we shall classify them in a general category of 'doxological formulae.' The texts of these passages read as follows:

4:11(c-)d

(ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται ὁ θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,)
ᾧ[2] ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν

---

[1] The absence from 5:11 of the phrase ἡ δόξα καὶ (which pertains to our formal definition of doxology that we shall present below) seems to force us to regard this passage as a variant from doxology. Text-critical evidence will be surveyed in the following footnote (fn. 1, p. 397). An instance comparable to 5:11 is found in I Tim. 6:16 (ᾧ τιμὴ- καὶ κράτος αἰώνιον . ἀμήν .)

[2] This relative pronoun takes ὁ θεός as its antecedent.

Selwyn, for instance, is in favour of considering Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as the antecedent of ᾧ, and he appeals to the following points for support: 1) 'the order of words,' 2) parallels especially in Rev. 1:6, and 3) 'Christ's own warrant' in Jn. 17:5 (The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 220).

It is syntactically possible, with Selwyn, to take Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as the antecedent, since it is the nearest noun to ᾧ. However, from a context-analytical point of view, this choice seems unwarranted: first, ὁ θεός is the subject of δοξάζηται, which in turn is modified by the adverbial phrase διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and it seems natural to take ἡ δόξα κτλ. as referring back to δοξάζηται to constitute its sequence of thought. Secondly, a problem in taking Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as the αἰώνων . ἀμήν .

(in order that in everything God may be glorified through Jesus Christ.) To him belong glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. (RSV)

5:11

αὐτῷ[1] τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων .[2] ἀμήν .

To him be the dominion for ever and ever. Amen. (RSV)

In the first two sections we shall study the doxological formulae as we find them in these two passages. In the third section we shall briefly survey the use of ἀμήν .

---

antecedent is already latent in the relative clause itself, since this view has to assume that Jesus is the medium and at the same time the object of the ascription of glory. See Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe; der Judasbrief, pp. 120-121.

[1] With regard to 5:11, one of the text-critical problems is the fact that, while vg^{cl} 33 69 1739 and others insert the phrase ἡ δόξα καί between αὐτῷ and τὸ κράτος , this phrase is omitted by B A and others. The omission of the phrase seems to be further confirmed by p^{72} and the Old Latin version. The omission appears to be preferable, and we rest our case for it upon the consensus of new evidence as well as upon the joint authority of B A (p^{72} omits the τό of τὸ κράτος . Its use of ἐῶνας for αἰῶνας is orthographically interesting).

Αὐτῷ refers back to αὐτός , which in turn stands for ὁ θεός .

[2] Unlike most major codices, B omits the phrase τῶν αἰώνων . The use of τῶν αἰώνων is supported by the Old Latin version, while p^{72} omits it. The case against the inclusion of this phrase seems inconclusive.

SECTION 1

Preliminary Observation

In this section we shall limit ourselves primarily to defining the 'doxological formulae.'

By 'doxology' we mean, from the viewpoint of content, a formula of ascription of praise, especially glory, to God or Christ. Doxology in this sense is not substantially different from other formulary expressions such as 'eulogical formula' (see I Ptr. 1:3-4) or aretalogy (cf. I Ptr. 2:9). That which distinguishes a doxology from other (liturgical-) formulary expressions is only the formal term: we shall call a formula which specifically ascribes 'glory' (δόξα), along with such items as 'power' and 'dominion,' to God or Christ, a doxology.[1] It ensues from this definition that we shall regard similar formulae, which do not mention 'glory,' as variants from doxology (cf. I Ptr. 5:11). Under 'doxological formulae' we shall include both doxology proper and its variants.

Doxologies or doxological formulae in the sense of our definition find their parallels in the O.T. and related literature as well as in the N.T. For the purpose of illustration, we shall list notable examples found in the former group of writings; then N.T. instances of doxology will be enumerated.

---

[1] In this regard, we follow Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), p. 65. Cf. pp. 65-69 and 74-75.

A. Doxological Formulae in the O.T. and the Related Literature

1. I Chron. 29:11

"Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heavens and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all." (RSV)

2. Ps. 29:1-2

"Ascribe to the Lord, O heavenly beings,
ascribe to the Lord glory and strength.
Ascribe to the Lord the glory of his name;
worship the Lord in holy array." (RSV)

3. Prayer of Manasses 15

"And I will praise thee for ever all the days of my life:
For all the host of heaven doth sing thy praise,
And thine is the glory for ever and ever. Amen."[1]

---

[1] E.t. by Ryle in Charles, APOT, I, 624.

4. I Esdras 4:59-60

> "From thee cometh victory, from thee cometh wisdom, and thine is the glory, and I am thy servant.
>
> Blessed art thou, who hast given me wisdom; and to thee I give thanks, O Lord of our fathers."[1]

In addition to these, a doxological ascription seems to be implied in I Enoch 27:5; 90:40; Baruch 2:18; IV Macc. 18:24.

These parallel instances apparently point to the (liturgical-)formulary background of the N.T. doxologies which we shall list below.[2]

---

[1] E.t. by Cook in Charles, APOT, I, 33.

[2] Cf. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 451-453 (Appendix VIII:'The Doxology in Matt. vi.13').

Oesterley employs 'doxology' in a wider sense; for him the term denotes, for instance, the eulogical expressions in the 'doxology' of the Shemoneh-Esreh (The Background of the Christian Liturgy [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925], p. 137).

I Clem. 61:3 and Didache 10:4, both of which are cited by Oesterley, are notable parallels to 'doxology' in the sense of our definition.

B. Doxologies in the N.T.

1. Matt. 6:13

ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεια καὶ [1] ἡ δύναμις καὶ[2] ἡ δόξα [3] εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας . ἀμήν .[4]

2. Lk. 2:14

δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη καὶ[5] ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας .[6]

3. Lk. 19:38b

(εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου. vs. 38a)

ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις .

4. Rom. 11:36b

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

5. Rom. 16:27

μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ , ᾧ[7] ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων .[8] ἀμήν.

---

[1] Omitted in k sa Did. [2] Omitted in sy^{c}.

[3] Omitted in k.

[4] This doxology is found in 𝔎 Θ al f (g^{1} k q sy sa Did). It is omitted in ℌ D pm it vg^{codd}. Cf. E. Lohmeyer, Das Vater-Unser (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952), pp. 162-174. Also Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 451-453.

[5] Καί is inserted in sy. It is omitted in it vg^{cl} Ir^{lat}.

[6] Εὐδοκία is found in 𝔎 Θ pl sy bo Or^{pt} Eus. Εὐδοκίας is supported by B* ℵ* D pc latt.

[7] ῾Ω is omitted in B pc f sy^{p}.

[8] The phrase τῶν αἰώνων is omitted in p^{46} BCL al.

6. Gal. 1:5

(τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν , vs. 4b),
ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

7. Phil. 4:20

τῷ δὲ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

8. Eph. 3:21

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ[1] ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

9. I Tim. 1:17

τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων , ἀφθάρτῳ ἀοράτῳ[2] μόνῳ
θεῷ ,[3] τιμὴ καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

10. II Tim. 4:18c

ᾧ[4] ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ,
ἀμήν.

---

[1] Καί is omitted in ℜ pm.

[2] The phrase ἀθανάτῳ ἀοράτῳ is found in d* lat sy^{hmg}. G has ἀφθάρτῳ ἀθανάτῳ ἀοράτῳ .

[3] Σοφῷ is inserted between μόνῳ and θεῷ in P ℜ pl sy^{h}.

[4] The antecedent of this relative pronoun is ὁ κύριος in vs. 18a.

11. Heb. 13:21c

ᾧ[1] ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων .[2]
ἀμήν .

12. I Ptr. 4:11d

ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

13. II Ptr. 3:18b

αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος .[3]

14. Jude 25

μόνῳ[4] θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν[5] δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία
πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος[6] καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντος τοὺς
αἰῶνας .[7] ἀμήν .

---

[1] The antecedent of this relative pronoun is ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης in vs. 20.

[2] The phrase τῶν αἰώνων is omitted in p^{46} D H 69 al arm.

[3] Ἀμήν is added in ℌ 𝔎 pl vg sy. It is omitted in B 1739 pc.

[4] Σοφῷ is inserted between μόνῳ and θεῷ in 𝔎 al.

[5] The phrase διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν is omitted in al.

[6] The phrase πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος is omitted in 𝔎 al.

[7] Τοὺς αἰῶνας for παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος is found in ℌ pc. The reading παντὸς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων is supported by L (33) pc vg^{cl} sy^{hmg}.

15. Rev. 1:5-6

Τῷ ἀγαπῶντι[1] ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι[2] ἡμᾶς ἐκ[3]
τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν[4] ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ,
καὶ[5] ἐποίησεν[6] ἡμᾶς[7] βασιλείαν,[8]
ἱερεῖς[9] τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ,[10] αὐτῷ
ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν
αἰώνων.[11] ἀμήν.

16. Rev. 4:11

ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν,[12]
λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν
δύναμιν, ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ

---

[1] P 1 al have ἀγαπήσαντι for ἀγαπῶντι.

[2] The reading λούσαντι is supported by 𝔎 P al gig vg. Λύσαντι is found in ℌ 1 pm h sy.

[3] 𝔎 P al favour ἀπό for ἐκ.

[4] Καί is omitted in A 1 al.

[5] The text revised by Westcott and Hort inserts a hyphen between αὐτοῦ and καί.

[6] The reading ποιήσαντι is found in 046 69 pc.

[7] Ἡμῖν is found in A 46 al. Ἡμῶν is favoured in C 2329 h vg^{codd}. Ἡμᾶς is supported by ℵ 𝔎 P 1 pm gig vg^{cl}.

[8] 046 69 al have βασίλειον for βασιλείαν. The phrase βασιλεῖς καί is found in P 1 al.

[9] 42 62 al have ἱεράτευμα for ἱερεῖς.

[10] A hyphen is inserted between αὐτοῦ and αὐτῷ in the text revised by Westcott and Hort.

[11] The phrase τῶν αἰώνων is omitted in A P pc.

[12] The phrase ὁ ἅγιος is added to ἡμῶν in 𝔎 al sy.

τὸ θέλημά σου[1] ἦσαν[2] καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν .

17. Rev. 5:12b

ἄξιός[3] ἐστιν τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον λαβεῖν
τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχὺν
καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν.

18. Rev. 5:13

τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ[4] καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ
ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ
κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

19. Rev. 7:12

ἀμήν, ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία
καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ
ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.[5]

20. Rev. 19:1b

ἀλληλουϊά. ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις
τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἀληθιναὶ καὶ δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις
αὐτοῦ. . . .

---

[1] 'Ουκ is inserted between σου and ἦσαν in 046 69 pc.

[2] P 1 pm have εἰσίν for ἦσαν.

[3] The reading ἄξιον is supported by ℵ C P 046 1 pl. Ἄξιος is found in A.

[4] ℵ P 1 pm have τοῦ θρόνου for τῷ θρόνῳ.

[5] Ἀμήν is omitted in C pc.

With regard to these N.T. parallel instances, the two following observations may be made:

1. As to the object of the ascription of glory, these doxological formulae can be classified as follows:

   i) those which take God as the object:
   Matt. 6:13; Lk. 2:14; Rom. 11:36b; 16:(25-)27;[1] Gal. 1:5; Phil. 4:20; Eph. 3:21; I Tim. 1:17; II Tim. 4:18c;[2] Heb. 13:21c;[3] I Ptr. 4:11d; Jude 25;[4] Rev. 4:11; 7:11;[5] 19:1b;

   ii) those which take Christ as the object:
   Lk. 19:38b;[6] II Ptr. 3:18b;[7] Rev. 1:5b-6;[8]

---

[1] So Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 349-355.

[2] So Kelley, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (Black's N.T. Commentaries; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963), p. 220. The title ὁ κύριος in II Timothy is exclusively ascribed to God. Against Spicq, Les Épîtres Pastorales (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1947), p. 396. Cf. Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe: der Judasbrief, p. 239 (and fn. 4).

[3] So Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, pp. 364-365.

[4] Cf. Schelkle, op. cit., pp. 174-175.

[5] See E. Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung des Johannes (HNT, 2nd ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1953), p. 71.

[6] Cf. Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (2nd ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p. 367.

[7] Schelkle, op. cit., p. 237.

[8] R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), Vol. I, p. 17.

5:12.

iii) doxology addressed to both God and Christ: Rev. 5:13.[1]

2. From a Gattung-defining point of view, most of the doxological formulae in Revelation (i.e., with the exception of 1:5b-6) are distinguished from the remaining N.T. instances by their literary structure.[2] In view of the particularly acclamatory character of these formulae, the refined structure and especially the occasions for citing these formulae which are vividly described,[3] their proper Gattung may be defined as 'song' (cf. ᾠδὴ καινή, Rev. 5:9) or 'hymn.'[4]

SECTION 2

Examination of the Doxological Formulae in I Ptr. 4:11d; 5:11

In this section we shall limit ourselves to taking up the two following questions:

---

[1] Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, pp. 149-151.

[2] Concerning Rev. 4:11 and 7:11, see Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung des Johannes, pp. 49-50 and 71, respectively.

[3] See Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 52-54. Also O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship (SBT; Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1953), p. 7 and passim. Cf. M. H. Shepherd, Jr., The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse (Ecumenical Studies in Worship; Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960), esp. pp. 77ff.

[4] Cf. Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte des N.Ts.," pp. 219-220.

1. What we have in I Ptr. 4:11d and 5:11 are doxological formulae used in epistolary contexts. Is it plausible to regard them as literally dependent upon the similar formulae in the 'Pauline and deutero-Pauline' epistles?

2. Does the doxology in 4:11d mark the end of one document, as separate from 4:12ff.?

A. Let us look at the first question. The solution of this question will have a bearing upon our attempt to answer the second one.

So far as the parallel instances in the O.T. and the related literature are concerned, no doxological formula is used there in an epistolary context. Contrariwise in the Pauline epistles, which belong to the earliest Christian epistolary literature, we do find this particular use. It is, therefore, possible to assume the Petrine dependence upon the Pauline usage; and if this assumption can be substantiated, the phrasing of the Petrine formulae may be understood in terms of their literary dependence upon the Pauline ones.

Now, the two following considerations seem to lessen the possibility of this Petrine dependence:

In the first place, from functional and context-analytical points of view, there are clear divergencies among the N.T. instances of doxology,[1] and this variety seems to point to the fact that the use of doxology in an epistolary context did not have a fixed function or place; rather the Ursprungsort of its use is to be looked for in the setting of (private and) public worship in the early Church.[2] The latter consideration

---

[1] From functional and context-analytical points of view, the doxologies found in the N.T. may be classified roughly as follows:

A. 1. concluding part of a large unit, which is followed by a parenetic section:
Rom:11:(34-)36; Eph. 3(14-)21; I Ptr. 4:11d.

2. concluding part of a personal thanksgiving:
I Tim. 1:17.
3. concluding part of a prescript (Eingangsprotokoll):
Gal. 1:5; Rev. 1:5b-6.
4. concluding part of personal notes, placed at the end of an epistle:
Phil. 4:20; II Tim. 4:18b.
5. part of an epistolary ending (Eschatokoll):
Heb. 13:21.
6. a mark of the end of an epistle:
II Ptr. 3:18b; Jude 25; Rom. 16:(25-)27
7. concluding part of an exhortatory note:
I Ptr. 5:11.

B. 1. concluding part of a prayer:
Matt. 6:13.
2. part of a prayer of praise to God:
Lk. 2:14; Rom. 11:(34-)36; 16:(25-)27.
3. part of a passage of praise to Christ:
Lk. 19:38.
4. (part of) hymnic pieces:
Rev. 4:11; 5:12, 13; 7:12; 19:1.

[2] The differences in the use of N.T. doxologies have been noted also by Delling (Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 65ff.). In passing it is to be remarked that Rom. 1:25 and 9:5, listed by Delling as doxolgies, are, properly speaking, eulogical formulae (see our discussion in Chapter III).

A suggestive observation about the doxologies is corresponds to the following facts: first, doxology, which takes God or Christ as the object of the ascription of glory, is 'liturgical' by nature. Secondly, at least some of the epistles were designed to be read in a corporate context, one of the most plausible occasions of which was public worship.[1] As we have already touched upon briefly in relation to our discussions in Chapters II and III, incorporation of various liturgical formulae into the epistolary context could well be expected because of the occcasion for which the epistle was planned to be read.

In the second place, there are certain terminological and syntactical differences between the Petrine doxological formulae and the Pauline ones, and these differences make it difficult to assume the Petrine dependence upon the Pauline formulae. i) In I Ptr. 4:11d, 'glory' (δόξα) and 'power' (κράτος) are combined; the doxological formula in 5:11 has κράτος alone. Now, in most of the doxologies in the Pauline (-deutero Pauline) epistles, only 'glory' is mentioned. Exceptional instances comparable to the Petrine formulae are found in I Tim. 6:16, where κράτος and 'honour' (τιμή) are combined, and in I Tim. 1:17, where δόξα and κράτος

---

presented in B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951, Photolithoprinted), pp. 464-465.

[1] See I Thess. 5:27; Col. 4:16. Cf. II Thess. 2:2, 15; I Cor. 7:17; 16:1. Delling, *Der Gottesdienst im N.T.*, p. 94.

are joined. Combination of δόξα with other attributes can be found elsewhere also (e.g., Jude 25; Rev. 1:6; 5:13). Admittedly, these instances are of a later date; however, this 'later date' need not be taken as indicative of a later date for I Peter itself, since there are also parallels to the similar combination in I Chron. 29:11; Ps. 29:1-2; Baruch 2:18. ii) Another remarkable feature of the Petrine doxology in 4:11d is that it is expressed in the indicative (note the use of ἐστίν). This indicative doxology is paralleled nowhere in the Pauline epistles; most of the Pauline instances appear to be precatory.[1]

When we bring these observations together, it seems difficult to conclude that there was Petrine dependence upon the Pauline formulae; rather it appears to be likely instead that the Petrine doxological formulae drew upon some formula different from the Pauline ones (although, within the scope of available evidence, the possibility of the Petrine dependence upon the Pauline use and phrasing may not after all be excluded).

B. Our second question is whether or not the doxology in 4:11d marks the end of one document, as is sometimes alleged. This question, in fact, is concerned with the problem of the integrity of I Peter as one epistle. Scholars who are in favour of the view that I Peter is composed of two originally separate documents (1:1-4:11 and 4:12ff.), have taken this doxology (along with other considerations)[1] as a mark of a break between that which precedes the doxology and 4:12ff.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Matt. 6:13. Also Rev. 4:11 (ἄξιος εἶ); 5:12b (ἄξιός ἐστιν). See Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 465.

Now, among the N.T. doxologies, this formula appears as an epistolary ending only in Rom. 16:(25-)27; Jude 25; and II Ptr. 3:18ff. Among these three instances, Rom. 16:27 can scarcely be properly called an epistolary conclusion, since this verse, together with vss. 25-26, forms a highly stylized unit, an appropriate Gattung for which may be a hymn, or some sort of liturgical piece.[3] As to Jude 25 and II Ptr.

---

[1] E.g. differences in the tone of allusions or references to persecution (i.e., persecution being hypothetical in the first; persecution being an imminent, real factor in the second part), notable duplication of subject-matter in the two parts.

[2] Perdelwitz, Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefes, pp. 14-15. Jülicher (-Fascher), Einleitung in das N.T. (7th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1931), pp. 199-200. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, pp. 6-9. W. Bieder, Grund und Kraft der Mission nach 1. Petrusbrief (Theologische Studien; Zürich: Evangelische Verlag, 1950), p. 11. F. Hauck, Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes (NTD, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), p. 36. Cf. P. Carrington, Primitive Christian Catechism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), pp. 31ff. (I Ptr. 1:1-4:11, Peter A; 4:12ff., Peter B). Also Windisch-Preisker, Die katholische Briefe, pp. 156-162. Also C. F. D. Moule, "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter," NTS, III (1956-57), 1-11. Moule's thesis was previously envisaged by Hart ("The First Epistle General of Peter" in Vol. V of The Expositor's Greek New Testament. [New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1910], pp. 29-30).

[3] See Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, pp. 350-351.

3:18b, their later date is to be taken into consideration.[1] The remaining instances of doxology (besides those used as the integral part of liturgical-formulary pieces) do not seem to form epistolary conclusions, although admittedly they do mark either the logical conclusion or the end of a literary unit.

As a matter of course, the plausibility of supposing I Ptr. 4:11d to represent the end of one document would be increased if it could be reinforced by differences in mode of allusions or references to persecution and in duplication of subject-matter, as well as terminological and syntactical features. A closer examination, however, seems instead to suggest that such differences do not substantiate the two documents hypothesis.[2]

In view of these observations, it seems unlikely that the doxology in 4:11d marks the end of one document, even though it and the ἀγαπητοί in 4:12 (note ἀγαπητοί in 2:11) admittedly do suggest a logical break between the two passages, one concluded by the doxology, the other preceded by the ἀγαπητοί .

---

[1] Cf. Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe: der Judasbrief, pp. 137-138 and 178-179.

[2] The following observations may be made against the position which takes the differences to be in favour of the two documents hypothesis:

There are four more or less explicit allusions to persecution in I Peter: 1:6-7; 3:13-17; 4:12-19 and 5:9. It seems evident that the last two allusions are more specific about the tribulation; there is a more urgent tone in them than in the first two allusions

The outcome of our brief study in Section 2 may be outlined as follows:

1. In view of certain literary-critical differences, it seems improbable that the doxological formulae in I Peter are dependent upon the Pauline ones. The use of these formulae in the epistolary context seems to depend upon a liturgical doxology; this dependence appears to be explicable in part by the nature of epistles which were, at least in some cases, designed to be read in the context of corporate worship.

(see the two instances of the optative in 3:14, 17). However, the difference between these two groups of allusions is not great; with Walls we note the following similar features (A. F. Walls in A. M. Stibbs, The First Epistle General of Peter, pp. 50-51. Cf. E. G. Selwyn, "The Persecutions in I Peter," Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, I (1950), 39-50.

i) Πειρασμός (4:12) and πειρασμοί (1:6) are used in a similarly figurative way.

ii) Persecution is regarded as the 'ground of rejoicing' in both sections (1:6; 4:13).

iii) "The same beatitude of the Lord is applied" in these two sections (3:14; 4:14).

iv) "The glory of suffering for doing good" (3:17); "the glory of suffering as a Christian" (4:16).

v) Obedience to civic authorities is urged in both sections (2:13ff.; 4:15).

These duplicate similarities may not be taken as indicative of the presence of two documents; rather they are to be attributed to the Petrine writer's literary mannerism (see the use of the motif of imitatio Christi in 2:21ff. and 3:18). This seems to be further confirmed by the fact that an appeal to resist evil, made with reference to the imminent tribulation (5:9) is not found in the first part (1:3-4:11. Walls, op. cit., p. 51, fn. 1). Thus we are in accord with Walls, who says, "Formally, iv. 12-v.11 is best treated as a recapitulation of what has gone before, strongly reinforcing its principal lessons." (Op. cit., p. 51.)

2. In view of meager parallel instances and the literary-critical problems, it seems difficult to regard the doxology in 4:11d as marking the end of one document, as is sometimes maintained.

SECTION 3

A Brief Survey of the Use of ἀμήν

In the liturgical-formulary use of ἀμήν found in I Ptr. 4:11d; 5:11 (and elsewhere in N.T. epistolary writings), we see one of the most evident indications of the history-of-liturgy legacy which the early Church inherited from its O.T.-Jewish antecedents. The purpose of our survey in this section is to review the use of ἀμήν in I Ptr. 4:11d; 5:11 against the parallel instances of it found in the O.T.-Jewish literature and in the N.T.

A. In the O.T. there are a number of instances of אָמֵן.[1] An individual may use it to express his personal confirmation of a statement made to him (Num. 5:22; Jer. 28:6). The instances in Num. 5:22 and in Neh. 5:13 imply particularly an affirmation of some formula.[1] אָמֵן in I Kg. 1:36 denotes a personal remark with an optative implication (cf. Jer. 28:6).[2] A number of other O.T. instances are associated with the communal setting (e.g., Deut. 27:16; 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26; Neh. 8:6; I Chron. 16:36).[3]

---

[1] Num. 5:22; Deut. 27:15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26; I Kg. 1:36; Isa. 65:16; Jer. 11:5; 28:6; Ps. 41:14; 72:19; 89:53; 106:48; Neh. 5:13; 8:6; I Chron. 16:36.

In Isa. 65:16, we have a notable designation of God, אֱלֹהֵי אָמֵן (ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινός, LXX). Instances comparable to this phrasing are found in Rev. 3:14; II Cor. 1:20. Cf. Schlier in TWNT, I, 341.

Some examples are connected with the use of liturgical formulae, e.g., I Chron. 16:36; Neh. 8:6; in these two passages the twice-pronounced אָמֵן stands for a congregational response.[4] With regard to the liturgical-formulary character of אָמֵן, notable instances are found at the end of the first four volumes in the Psalms (Ps. 41:13; 72:19; 89:52; 106:48). The twice-repeated אָמֵן there marks the 'solemn conclusion and confirmation' of the preceding eulogical expression, and probably is a reflection of usage as a congregational response, made in association with eulogical formulae.[5]

---

[1] See Egon Pfeiffer, "Der alttestamentliche Hintergrund der liturgische Formel 'Amen,'" Kerygma und Dogma, IV (1958), esp. 134-135. Cf. Gustav Dalman, Die Worte Jesu (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898), Vol. I, p. 185.

[2] See Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 133.

[3] See ibid., p. 135. [4] Schlier in TWNT, I, 339.

[5] See H. -J. Kraus, Die Psalmen (BKAT, 2nd ed.; Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), p. 315. A Weiser, Die Psalmen (ATD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), p. 233. Cf. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, pp. 70-71. Also Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 138.

The liturgical-formulary use of ἀμήν is paralleled in the Apocryphal writings. In III Macc. 7:23, ἀμήν is used to conclude the preceding eulogy. In IV Macc. 18:24, it is associated with a doxological formula.

The same use is paralleled in the DSS.[1] For instance, in IQS I:18b-20, we read as follows:[2]

> And when they pass into the Covenant, the priests and Levites shall bless the God of deliverances and all His works of truth. And all who pass into the Covenant shall say after them, Amen, Amen!

Quite obviously, ἀμήν here becomes a congregational response to the ascription of blessing to God (cf. Neh. 8:6; I Chron. 16:36).[3]

The use of ἀμήν is abundantly evidenced in the Rabbinic literature. Although this word is used also outside the context of communal worship,[4] ἀμήν seems to have had an assured place in the synagogue worship, in which it was used as a congregational response to words of praise to God; especially it was said by worshippers after the Aaronic benediction (Num. 6:24-26) and was pronounced as an alternative formula to the one used in temple worship (i.e,, "Praised be the name of His glorious Kingdom always and forever").[1]

---

[1] Pfeiffer refers to the following passages: IQS I:18b-20; II:10, 18 ("Der alttestamentliche Hintergrund der litrugische Formel 'Amen,'" pp. 136-138).

[2] E.t. by G. Vemes in A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran (Cleveland/New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962), p. 74.

[3] Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 136-138.

[4] See Str.-Bill., III, 456-457 and the notes on pp. 458-459. Cf. Frör, "Salutationen, Benediktionen, Amen" in Leiturgia, III, 592. Also Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., pp. 73-74.

In the LXX, there are a number of instances of as the transliterated form of אָמֵן ;[2] on the other hand, this Hebrew word is sometimes rendered by γένοιτο .[3] Jer. 35:6 has ἀληθός for אָמֵן .

These numerous instances point to the prevalence of ἀμήν in the O.T.-Jewish milieu of life and worship.[4]

B. The instances of ἀμήν in the N.T. may be classified into two groups: the first group is composed of the instances of ἀμήν used by Jesus in an emphatic manner in connection with His making important statements.[5] The second group includes most of the remaining instances which appear as the acclamatory conclusion of eulogical or doxological formulae.[6]

---

[1] See Str.-Bill, III, 456 and the notes on pp. 457-458.

[2] E.g., I Chron. 16:36; I Esdras 9:46(B); Neh. 5:13 (II Esdras 15:18); 8:6; Tob. 8:8; 14:15; III Macc. 7:23; IV Macc. 18:24.

[3] E.g., Deut. 27:15-26; I Kg. 1:36; Jer. 11:5; Ps. 106:48.

[4] Cf. A. Stuiber, "Amen" in Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, I (1958), 153-159; esp. 153.

[5] E.g., Mk. 3:28; 8:12; 9:1, 4; 10:15, 29; 11:23; 12:43; 13:30; 14:9, 18, 25, 30. On these and related instances, see Joachim Jeremias, "Kennzeichen der ipsissima vox Jesu" in Synoptische Studien, Wikenhauser--Festschrift (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953), pp. 86-93; esp. pp. 89ff. Also Dalman, Die Worte Jesu pp. 185-187.

[6] Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 11:36; 15:33 (p^{45} A G pc); 16:24

The liturgical-formulary character of the latter instances seems evident in their being related to eulogical or doxological formulae. The fact that ἀμήν was used as a congregational response in the corporate worship of the early Church, and that the instances of the second group seem to reflect the original use of ἀμήν in worship, is strongly suggested by I Cor. 14:16. In this Corinthians passage, ἀμήν is specifically connected with the offering of a prayer of thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία).[1] From the use of the preposition ἐπί in

---

(𝔎 D pm it vg^{s} vg^{cl}); 16:27 (p^{47} B C L al); I Cor. 16:24 (ℵ A D pl vg. sy. Omitted in B F 33 pc it); II Cor. 13:13 (𝔎 D pl lat sy); Gal. 1:5; 6:24 (𝔎 D pl lat sy); Phil. 4:20, 23 (p^{46} ℵ A 𝔎 D pl lat sy. Omitted in B G pc); Col. 4:18 (𝔎 D pl lat sy); I Thess. 5:28 (ℵ A 𝔎 pl. Omitted in B D F 33 pc); I Thess. 3:18; I Tim. 1:17; 6:16; 21 (P 𝔎 pl f vg sy); II Tim. 4:18, 22 (P 𝔎 D pl lat sy); Tit. 3:15 (H P 𝔎 pl lat sy); Phm. 25 (ℵ C 𝔎 pl lat sy. Omitted in A D* 33 pc); Heb. 13:21, 25 (A C 𝔎 D pl lat sy. Omitted in p^{46} ℵ* 33); I Ptr. 4:11; 5:11; II Ptr. 3:18 (ℌ 𝔎 pl vg sy. Omitted in B 1739 pc); I Jn. 5:21 (P 𝔎 al vg^{cl}); II Jn. 13 (𝔎 pm sy); Jude 25; Rev. 1:6; 5:14; 7:12; 19:4; 22:21 (ℵ 𝔎 2329 pl vg sy sa. Omitted in A pc gig).

[1] See H. D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (NTD, 7th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), p. 112. Also H. Lietzmann (--W. G. Kümmel), An die Korinther I/II (HNT, 4th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr--Paul Siebeck--, 1949), p. 72.

the phrase ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ,[1] one may infer that ἀμήν is assumed to follow this prayer. Instances to the same effect are found in Rev. 5:14; 7:12 and 19:4. In the context of heavenly worship, ἀμήν is used in these passages either as an antiphonal response (Rev. 5:14; 19:4)[2] or as an acclamatory formula to initiate and conclude a hymnic piece.

The instances of ἀμήν in I Ptr. 4:11d and 5:11 seem to correspond to these examples of a liturgical-formulary nature, since they also are affixed to the doxological formulae. Now, if one can assume a text-critically assured place for these two instances, as well as some cases in other N.T. epistolary writings, the use of ἀμήν, as represented in these passages, seems to suggest another interesting aspect: in contrast to doxological or eulogical formulae, which restore their original liturgical-formulary character when they are read in the context of public worship, as part of an epistle, ἀμήν used in the epistolary context (as we find it, e.g., in I Peter) is now a literary convention to denote the precatory affirmation by the writer himself with reference to the foregoing doxological or eulogical formulae; that is, ἀμήν as represented in the N.T. epistolary writings seems to have lost its original character as a congregational response, while retaining its original association with liturgical-formulary pieces.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Moule, An Idiom-Book of N.T. Greek, p. 50.

[2] See Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 25. Also Frör, "Salutationen, Benediktionen, Amen," p. 593. As to an antiphonal use of ἀμήν, an interesting case may be found in Didache 10:6. For a plausible reconstruction of an antiphonal scheme from this Didache passage, see H. Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl (3rd ed.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1955), p. 237. Also O. Cullmann, Die Christologie des N.Ts., pp. 216-217. Cf. Kraus, Die Psalmen, p. 315.

Our survey in Section 3 may be summed up as follows:

1. There are numerous examples of ἀμήν in the O.T.-Jewish literature. Especially those of a liturgical-formulary character seem to form a (history-of-liturgy) background of the N.T. instances which are connected with doxological or eulogical pieces.

2. The ἀμήν in I Ptr. 4:11d and 5:11 seems to reflect its originally liturgical-formulary use; at the same time, its incorporation into the present epistolary context suggests that it is now deprived of its original character as an actual congregational response.

---

[1] Cf. Delling, Der Gottesdienst im N.T., p. 75. Delling characterizes the use of ἀμήν in the epistolary context as a 'proleptic' use of it for a congregational response.

CONCLUSION

Our study belongs to a type of inquiry, the plausibility of which is primarily dependent upon the validity of the question posed and of the procedure used to solve the question. By way of presenting a conclusion, we shall recapitulate our basic intent and the procedure as well as the rationale behind it; only against this background can a proper assessment be made of the detailed outcome of our study in each section of these chapters.

It has been the purpose of our inquiry to examine the 'formulary' material in I Peter from a history-of-tradition point of view. By this we have meant an attempt to seek an alternative, for a proper elucidation of the literary similarities which this Epistle shares with the rest of the N.T. writings, to the hitherto dominant position which has taken those similarities simply as evidence for a direct literary dependence of I Peter especially upon the Pauline (and deutero-Pauline) epistles.

In the formulary material in I Peter there are two main types: to the first type belong a few formulary pieces, the Gattungen of which are self-evident (i.e., 'salutation formulae' in 1:2; 5:14, 'doxological formulae' in 4:11d; 5:11); each one of these pieces composes by itself an independent unit, clearly distinguished from the rest of the Epistle. The formulary pieces of the second type are the ones which are incorporated into the texture of the epistolary context (1: 17a, 18-19, 20; 3:18, 19, 22). An eulogical formula in 1:3-4 stands between these two types. The detection of material of the second type (including the eulogical formula in 1:3-4) has been carried out by noting 1) terminological and other related features which seem to distinguish the passage under consideration from the rest of the Epistle, 2) the context-analytical aporia, 3) the 'formulary' features which seem to correspond to the 'formulary criteria' which we have set up at the outset, and 4) the parallel instances found elsewhere in the N.T. By systematizing this preliminary procedure (which has not always been well organized in previous studies) we have tried to give a more objective character to the procedure and outcome of the detection of traditional formulary material. When a piece of such material was detected, its scope was defined, and an attempt was made to reconstruct the possible original text. Then we asked whether a proper Gattung could be assigned to that piece.

We have directed our history-of-tradition inquiry to the 'traditional formulary piece' (or some segments of it) thus detected and defined, by relating it to its possible N.T. parallels of various sorts. The range of parallels covered not only the Pauline or deutero-Pauline examples (as has been the case with some scholars), but also other instances, including those in the Gospels and Acts. This wider range of examination has helped us considerably either to establish an important history-of-tradition relationship of the Petrine piece concerned with non-Pauline parallel instances or to elucidate a probable history-of-tradition background of the affinity exhibited by the parallel instances concerned. In this regard, one may refer to Section 2 of Chapters III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII. Especially our studies on the motif of regeneration in 1:3-4 (Chapter III) and on the theme of the impartiality of God in 1:17a (Chapter IV) seem to have brought out the possibility that either an apologetic-kerygmatic intent of the early Church or a theologizing effort of the Church to cope with a new situation, which had arisen within it, might have been at work in the process of formulation of the aforesaid motif and theme.

One basic question constantly raised during the course of our history-of-tradition examination of the two types of traditional, formulary material was whether or not the literary affinities shared by the Petrine piece and the parallel instance could be taken as indicative of a direct literary relationship of the former to the latter. Within the scope of our inquiry, it seems to be one of the assured results that there has been no piece of positive evidence to prove that the formulary material in I Peter is directly dependent upon the Pauline or deutero-Pauline epistles. Along with this concluding observation, we have often made this reservation that the possibility for such a relationship of direct dependence might not after all be excluded, since, quite admittedly, the Pauline corpus belongs to the earliest of early Christian literary products. However, we have repeatedly found it difficult to substantiate this possibility, because of the traditional formulary character of the Petrine pieces, on the one hand, and the possible derivation of the Pauline parallels from some pre-Pauline, traditional material, on the other. When the latter possibility can be ascertained by means of an 'analysis of traditional material,' or a form-critical examination, the problem of a direct literary relationship of the Pauline passage with a seemingly parallel passage in I Peter becomes extremely complex. However, one has to try to cope with this complexity in order to give an appropriate history-of-tradition assessment of the literary affinities. At the same time, precisely because of this complexity, it seems that more credit is to be given to the decision (as to a possibility of a direct literary relationship), made primarily on the basis of a comparative examination of elementary literary-critical features (i.e., terminological, conceptual, structural and sometimes context-analytical features). So far as we have seen, there has been no instance of literary-critical similarity which would upset our negative, though qualified, decision about the possibility of a direct literary dependence. At any rate, it does not seem to do justice to the history-of-tradition character of any relevant Pauline passage to take it as an immediate, primary basis for establishing a direct literary relationship of it with any Petrine passage, unless the Pauline passage is first subjected to a form-critical and history-of-tradition scrutiny. Our study as a whole has aimed at verifying this line of consideration. If such a line of inquiry is in some way justifiable, as we do hope, those who still adhere to the hitherto dominant position seem to be called upon to present a cogent exegetical rationale which would outweigh the (form-critical and) history-of-tradition considerations.

It appears to be a predicament of every exegetical inquiry to be overcome by another inquiry based on 'more certain certainty'; so ours may be also. But meanwhile, we shall hope that, as one of the possible alternatives for a proper elucidation of the literary similarities, a history-of-tradition inquiry as suggested in this study will have its role to play in future research on this ever-fascinating Epistle.

EXCURSUS

EXCURSUS

This excursus is presented here to illustrate the variety in identifying parallels (or defining the scope of parallels) and in ascribing the degree of probability of dependence to the parallels as we find in the studies carried out by the scholars who ascertain the literary dependence of I Peter upon the Pauline epistles.

It is to be kept in mind that some of these cases are compared between the passages of certain length, while sometimes a comparison is made between shorter sentences or phrases.

The number at the top of the list stands for the following scholars (bibliographical identification is briefly made at the end of this excursus):

1 . . .	Baur	2 . . .	Seufert
3 . . .	Usteri	4 . . .	Zahn
5 . . .	Knopf	6 . . .	Foster
7 . . .	Barnett	8 . . .	Mitton

Asterisks signify the parallel passages examined by the scholars indicated; the letters (abcd and ABCD) denote the degree of dependence ascribed by Foster and Barnett, respectively (a and A signify the highest degree of probability).

I Peter	Paul. Epistles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1:2	Rom.8:28-30						c	A	
	Eph.1:5						c	C	
	(+Eph.1:5-7?)							(C)	
	II Thess.2:13							C	
1:3-12	Eph.1:3-20				*	*		A	
1:3	Eph.1:1						c	B	
	Eph.1:3						a-b		*
	Eph.1:3+2:4								*
	II Cor.1:3						d		
	Eph.2:4			*					
1:4-5	Gal.3:18,23;4:7							C	
1:4	Col.1:5			*					
	Rom.5:3-4						d		
1:8	Eph.6:24							*	
	II Cor.5:7							*	
1:10-12	Eph.3:2-6 (+ Col.1:26-27)								*
	Eph.3:5,10			*					
1:12	Eph.3:5					*	b	B	
	Eph.3:5 (+ Col.1:26-27)			*					
1:13-17				*					
1:14-15	Rom.12:2		*		*	*	b	B	
	Eph.2:3;4:17,18							B	
	Eph.4:18,22						d		

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1:14	Rom.12:2			*					
1:14,1	Eph.4:17,18 + 1:4,7			*					
1:17	Rom.2:11,6						b		
	II Cor.1:12(+ Gal.1:13)			*					
	Eph.6:9						d		
	Col.3:25			*					
1:19-20							b	C	
1:20	Rom.16:25						a*-b		
	Eph.1:10						d		
1:20-21	Eph.3:9-10							C	
	Rom.4:24							C	
1:20	Rom.4:24						b		
	Eph.1:20						a-b		
1:22	Rom.12:9-10			*			b	C	
2:1-2	Eph.4:22-23							C	
	Eph.4:22						d		
2:1	Eph.4:22,25(+ Col.3:8)			*					*
	Rom.12:1				*	*		C	
2:2-6	Eph.2:18-22(+ Rom.5:2;I Cor. 3:12;Col.2:19, 7)								*
2:3-6	Rom.9:32-33				*	*		C	
	Eph.2:18-22				*	*	a-b	C	

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2:4-5	Eph.2:18-22			*					
2:5	Rom.12:1	*	*	*	*	*	c	C	
2:6-8	Rom.9:32-33			*					
2:6	Rom.9:33						a*-b		
2:9	Rom.8:28,30						d		
	Eph.1:14							C	
	Eph.2:14+5:8						d		
	Col.1:12-13 (Cf.Rom.13:12 & I Thess.5: 4-5)			*					
2:9b	Rom.13:12						c		
2:10	Rom.9:25-26							C	
	Rom.9:26						c		
2:11	Rom.7:23			*			b	C	
	Gal.5:16-17							C	
	Gal.5:17			*					
	Eph.2:19						c		
2:13-17	Rom.13:1-7	*	*	*	*	*	b	B	
	Gal.5:13							C	
2:18	Eph.6:5					*	b		*
2:19	Rom.13:5							C	
2:21-24	II Cor.5:21							C	
	Rom.6:2,11,18						b		
	Rom.6:2							C	

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3:1	Eph.5:22 (& Col.3:18)								*
3:1,7	Eph.5:22					*	b		
3:4	Rom.2:16;7:22						b		
	I Cor.14:25						b		
3:6	Gal.4:24,26					*		C	
(1:4-5 +) 3:6(+2:16)	Gal.3:23+4:7+ 4:24+5:13					*			
3:6	Eph.5:22b,33						b		
3:7	Eph.5:25 (& Col.3:19)								*
3:8ff.	Rom.12:9ff.			*					
3:8	Rom.12:10;15:5						b		
	Eph.4:32						b	C	
3:9-10	Rom.12:17			*					
3:9	Rom.12:17		*		*	*	b	C	
	Rom.12:14						b		
3:13	Rom.13:3							C	
	Rom.8:31						d		
3:18	Rom.5:6						b	B	
	Eph.2:18						b		
3:19	Eph.4:9						a-b		
3:21-22	Eph.1:19-21				*	*		C	
	Eph.1:20-21(& Col.2:12;3:1; 1:16)								*
	Eph.1:20-22								

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3:21	Rom.6:4;4:25 10:9						c		
3:22	Rom.8:34						b		
	Rom.8:38						b		
	Rom.8:38;Eph. 1:20-21;Col. 2:12;3:1;1:16								*
4:1	Rom.6:6-8		*			*		C	
	Rom.6:7			*			b		
	Rom.6:13			*					
4:2-3							b	C	
4:2	Rom.6:12						d		
4:4	Eph.5:18							*	
4:6	Eph.4:9							*	
4:7a	Rom.13:11-12		*				b	A	
4:7b	Rom.12:12							A	
4:8	Rom.12:9						c	A	
4:9	Rom.12:13						c	A	
4:10-11	Rom.12:3,6							A	
4:10	Rom.12:6						a*-b		
	Eph.3:2							C	
(4:12)	(Eph.6:4 & Col.3:21)								*
4:13-14	Rom.8:17-18		*					B	
4:13	Rom.8:17						a*-b		

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4:19	I Thess.							*	
5:1	Rom.8:17-18						a*-b	B	
5:3	II Cor.1:24							C	
5:4	I Cor.9:25							*	
5:5	Eph.5:21;6:1(& Col.3:20)								*
5:7	I Thess.5:6							*	
5:8-9	Eph.6:11						a*-b		
5:12	Rom.5:2							*	
	Eph.6:21						c		
5:13	Rom.16:16						d		
5:14	Rom.16:16						d		

1. F. C. Baur, "Der erste Petrusbrief,..."(*TJ* 1856,pp.193-240).
2. W. Seufert, "Die Abhängigkeit des I. Petr. vom Römerbrief"(*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 1874, pp.360-380).
3. J. M. Usteri, *Wissenschaftliche und Praktische Commentar über der ersten Petrusbrief* (1887),*passim*.
4. T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2nd ed.,1900, vol.II).
5. R. Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä* (1912), *passim*.
6. O. D. Foster, *The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter"* (1913), *passim*.
7. A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes A Literary Influence* (1941), pp.51-69.
8. C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (1951), *passim*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

-- cited or consulted --

Aalen, Svere, "Das Abendmahl als Opfermahl im Neuen Testament"(in: *Charis kai Sophia*. K.H.Rengstorf-Festschrift. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1964, pp.128-152).

Abott, T.K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (*ICC*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897).

Abrahams, I., *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1924).

Abramowski, R., "Der Christus der Salomooden" (*ZNW*. XXXV, 1936, pp.44-69).

Aland, Kurt, "Der Tod des Petrus in Rom" (*Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe*, 1961, pp.41-46).

Aleith, Eva, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1937).

Althaus, Paul, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*NTD*. 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

Archer, R. L., "The Epistolary Form in the New Testament" (*Exp.T*. LXIII, 1952, pp.296-298).

Asting, Ragnar, *Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930).

Bacon, B. J., *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Co./London: Macmillan & Co., 1927).

Barclay, William, *The Letters of James and Peter* (2nd ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).

Barnard, L. W., "The Testimonies concerning the Stone in the New Testament and in the Epistle of Barnabas" (in: vol. III of *Studia Evangelica*. *TU* no.88. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp.306-313).

Barnett, A. E., *Paul Becomes A Literary Influence*(Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941).

Barr, James, *Biblical Words for Time*(*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1962).

Barrett, C. K., "The Background of Mark 10:45"(in: *New Testament Essays*. Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp.1-18).

----- ,*The Gospel according to St. John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955).

----- ,*The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: Macmillan & Co.,1947).

Barth, Markus, *Was Christ's Death A Sacrifice?*(Edinburgh/London: Oliver & Boyd, 1961).

Bauer, Walter, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*(edited and adapted by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press/ Cambridge: University Press, 1957).

Baur, Ferdinand Christian, "Der erste Petrusbrief, mit besondere Beziehung auf das Werk: *Der petrinische Lehrbegriff*"(*Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1856, pp.193-240).

----- ,*Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*(3rd ed. Tübingen: Verlag und Druck von L. Fr. Fues, 1863).

----- ,*Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*(Stuttgart: Becher & Müller, 1845).

Beare, Francis W.,"The Epistle to the Ephesians: Introduction and Exegesis"(in: *The Interpreter's Bible*,vol.X. New York/Nashville: Abington Press, 1953, pp.597ff.).

----- ,*The First Epistle of Peter*(2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958).

----- ,"The Sequence of Events in Acts 9 to 15, and the Career of Peter's"(*JBL*. LXII, 1943, pp.295-306).

Beare, Francis W.,"Some Remarks on the Text of I Peter in the Bodmer Papyrus(p^{72})"(in: vol.III of *Studia Evangelica*. *TU* no.88. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp.263-265).

------ ,"The Teaching of First Peter"(*Anglican Theological Review* XXVII,1945, pp.284-296).

------ ,"The Text of I Peter in Papyrus 72"(*JBL*. LXXX, 1961, pp.253-260).

Beck, J. K., *Erklärung der Briefe Petri*(Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1896).

Behm, Johannes, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*(*NTD*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

Bertram, Georg, "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu vom Kreuz aus und der Glaube an seine Aufstehung"(in: *Festgabe für Adolf Deismann*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1927, pp.187-217).

Betz, Johannes, "Der Abendmahlskelch im Judenchristentum" (in: *Abhandlungen über Theologie und Kirche*. Karl Adam-Festschrift. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1952, pp.109-137).

Betz, Otto, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1960).

Beyer, H. W., *Die Apostelgeschichte*(*NTD*. 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

------ ,(& Paul Althaus, H. Rengstorf, G. Heinzelmann, A. Oepke) *Die kleine Briefe des Apostels Paulus*(*NTD*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955).

Beyer, Klaus, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962. Bd.I. Teil 1).

Bieder, Werner, *Grund und Kraft der Mission*(*Theologische Studien*. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1950).

------ ,*Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Christi* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949).

Bigg, Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*(*ICC*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901).

Bischoff, A., "Ἀλλοτρι(ο)επίσκοπος "(*ZNW* VII, 1906, pp. 271-274).

Bishop, Eric F. F., "A Living and Unchanging God, 1. Pet. 1:23"(*The Muslim World* XLIII, 1953, pp.15-17).

------ ,"*Oligoi* in 1. Pet. 3:20"(*The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* XIII, 1951, pp.44-45).

Black, Matthew, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*(2nd ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954).

Blass, F., Debrunner, A., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*(11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).

Blenkin, G. W., *The First Epistle General of Peter*(*CGTSC*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1914).

Blinzler, J., "Ἱεράτευμα :zur Exegese von I. Ptr.2:5 und 9"(in:*Studien ... Kardinal von Faulhaber dargebracht*. Regensburg: Gregorius-Verlag, 1949, pp.49-65).

Boismard, M.-E., "Une Liturgie baptismale dans la Prima Petri. I. Son influence sur Tit. I Jo. et Col."(*RB*. LXIII, 1956, pp.182-208). "II. Son influence sur l'épître de Jacques"(*RB* LVI, 1957, pp.161-183).

------ ,*Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la Première Epître de Pierre*(Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961).

------ ,"La typologie baptismale dans la première épître de saint Pierre"(*Verbum Salutis* XCIV, 1956, pp.339-352).

Bonnard, Pierre, *L'Epître de Saint Paul aux Galates*(*CNT*. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1953).

Bonsirven, J., *Le Judaisme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*(Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils; 2 vols., 1934-35).

------ ,*Théologie du Nouveau Testament*(Paris: Aubier, Editions Montaign, 1951).

Boobeyer, G. H., "The Indebtedness of 2. Peter to 1. Peter"(in: *New Testament Essays*. Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp.34-53).

Bornemann, W., "Der I. Ptr — eine Taufpredigt des Silvanus?"(*ZNW* XIX, 1919/20, pp.143-165).

Bornkamm, Günther, *Das Ende des Gesetzes* (Gesammelte Aufsätze Bd.I. 4th ed. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963).

-----, *Jesus von Nazareth*(3rd ed. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1959).

-----, *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum* (Gesammelte Aufsätze Bd.II. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1959).

-----, (& G. Barth; H. J. Held), *Ueberlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäus-evangelium*(2nd ed. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961).

Bousset, W., *Kyrios Christos*(3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926).

-----, (& Hugo Gressmann) *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*(3rd ed. Berlin: Reuter & Reichert, 1926).

Bowman, John, "Samaritan Studies"(*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* XL, 1958, pp.298-327).

Brandt, W., "Wandel als Zeugnis nach dem I. Petrusbrief" (in: *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum*. O.Schmitz-Festschrift. Witten-Rhur: Luther-Verlag, 1953, pp.10-25).

Branscomb, B. H., *The Gospel of Mark*(*MNTC*. New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1937).

Braumann, Georg, *Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverständnis bei Paulus*(Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1962).

Braun, Herbert, *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1962).

Braun, Herbert, *Das Leiden Christi*(*Theologische Existenz heute*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1940).

-----, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus*(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1957. 2 vols.).

Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C. A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*(Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1907).

Brown, John Pairman, "An Early Revision of the Gospel of Mark"(*JBL*. LXXVIII, 1959, pp.215-217).

-----, "The Form of 'Q' Known to Matthew"(*NTS* VIII, 1961/62, pp.27-42).

-----, "Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form-History"(*NTS* X, 1963, pp.27-48).

Büchsel, F., *Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus* (Gütelsloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928).

Bultmann, Rudolf, "Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes"(in: *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1927, pp.138-158).

-----, "Der Begriff des Wort Gottes im Neuen Testament"(in: *Glauben und Verstehen*.vol.I. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1961, pp.268-293).

-----, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief"(*Coniectanea Neotestamentica* XI, 1947, pp.1-14).

-----, "Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments"(in: *Glauben und Verstehen*. vol.I. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1961, pp.245-267).

-----, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (*KEK*. 15th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

-----, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

-----, *Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die Kynisch-stoische Diatribe*(*FRLANT*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910).

Bultmann, Rudolf, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*(3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1958).

------ ,"Die Wandlung des Selbstverständnisses der Kirche in der Geschichte des Urchristentums"(in: *Glauben und Verstehen*. vol.III. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1960, pp.131-141).

------ ,(A bookreview of Oscar Cullmann, *Les Premières Confessions de foi Chrétienne*)(*Theologische Literaturzeitung* LXXIV, 1949, pp.40-42).

Burton, Ernest De Witt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*(*ICC*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928).

------ ,*Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem*(Chicago: The University Press, 1904).

Buse, S. J.,"Baptism in Other New Testament Writings"(in: *Christian Baptism*. ed. by A. Gilmore. London: Lutterworth Press, 1959, pp.170-186).

Buttrick, G. A. et al(ed.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*(New York/Nashville: Abington Press, 1962. 4 vols.).

Campenhausen, Hans von, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936).

------ ,*Kirchliche Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in der drei Jahrhunderten*(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1953, pp.163-166).

Carmignac, J.,"Les citations de l'Ancien Testament, et specialement des poèms du Serviteur, dans des Hymnes de Qumran"(*Revue de Qumran* II/3. no.7, 1960, pp.357-393).

Carrington, Philip, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1940).

------ ,"Saint Peter's Epistle"(in: *The Joy of Study*. F. C. Grant-Festschrift. New York: Macmillan Co., 1951, pp.57-61).

Cerfaux, L., Christ in the Theology of St. Paul(E. t. by G. Webb & A. Walker. New York: Herder & Herder, 1959).

------ ,The Church in the Theology of St. Paul(E.t. by G. Webb & A. Walker. New York: Herder & Herder, 1959).

------ ,"Regale sacerdotium"(in: Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, S. A., 1954, vol.II, pp.283-315).

Chaine, J.,"Descente du Christ aux enfers"(in: Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible. Libraire Letousey et Ané, 1934. vol.II, columns 432-445).

Charles, R. H.(ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament(Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913. 2 vols.).

------ ,A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John(ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920. 2 vols.).

Chase, F. H., "Peter, First Epistle of"(in: vol.III of A Dictionary of the Bible. ed. J. Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906, pp.779-796).

Clemen, Carl, Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources(E.t. by R. G. Nisbet. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (ed.), The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1905).

Connolly, R. H.,"The Early Syriac Creed"(ZNW VII, 1906, pp.202-223).

Conzelmann, Hans, Die Apostelgeschichte(HNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1962).

------ ,Die Mitte der Zeit(4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1962).

Coutts, John, "Ephesians 1:3-14 and I. Peter 1:3-12"(NTS III, 1957, pp.115-127).

Cranfield, C. E. B.,*The First Epistle of Peter*(*Torch Bible Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1950).

------ "The Interpretation of I Peter 3:19 and 4:6" (*Exp.T*. LXII, 1958, pp. 369-372).

Creed, John Martin, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan & Co.,1930).

Crehan, Joseph, S. J., *Early Christian Baptism and the Creed*(London: Burns-Washbourne, Ltd.,1950).

Cross, F. L., *I Peter: A Paschal Liturgy*(London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1954).

Cullmann, Oscar,*Baptism in the New Testament*(*SBT*. E.t. by J. K. S. Reid. London: SCM Press, 1950).

------ ,*Die Christologie des Neuen Testament*(2nd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1958).

------ ,*Christus und die Zeit*(J.t.by Goroh Mayeda. Tokyo:Iwanami Shoten, 1954).

------ ,*Early Christian Worship*(*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1953. E. t.by A. S. Todd & J.B. Torrance).

------ ,*The Early Church*(E.t. by A. J. B. Higgins. London:SCM Press, 1956).

------ ,*Petrus:Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer*(2nd ed. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli-Verlag, 1960).

------ ,*Les Premières Confessions de foi Chrétienne* (2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948).

------ ,"Les récentes études sur la formation de la tradition évangelique"(*Revue d'Hisroire et de Philosophie religieuses* V, 1925, pp.459-477; 564-579).

------ ,*Der Staat im Neuen Testament*(2nd ed.Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1961).

Cumont, Franz, *The Mysteries of Mithra* (E.t. by T. J. McCormack. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.,1956).

Dahl, N. A.,"Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes" (*TZ* VII, 1951, pp.241-264).

----- ,"Anamnesis -- Memoire et Commemoration dans le christianisme primitif--"(*Studia Theologica* I, 1948, pp.69-95).

----- ,"Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt"(in: *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954, pp.3-9).

----- ,*Das Volk Gottes*(2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchsgesellschaft, 1963).

Dalman, Gustaf,*Jesus-Joshua*(Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1922).

----- ,*Die Worte Jesu*(2nd ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930, vol.I).

Danby, Herbert, *The Mishnah*(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).

Daniélou, Jean, *Sacramentum Futuri*(Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1950).

----- ,*Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*(Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1957).

Daube, David, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956).

----- ,"Participle and Imperative in I. Peter"(in: E. G. Selwyn,*The First Epistle of St. Peter*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan & Co.,1955, pp.467-488).

Dautzenberg, Gerhard,"Soteria phychon (1 Petr. 1,9)" (*Biblische Zeitschrift* VIII, 1964, pp.262-276).

Davidson, Samuel, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1848-51. 3 vols.).

----- ,*An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*(2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1882. vol.I, pp.501-532).

Davies, J. G., He Ascended Into Heaven (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958).

Davies, W. D., Christian Origins and Judaism (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962).

-----, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (2nd ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1955).

-----, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: The University Press, 1964).

Deissmann, Adolf, Bibelstudien (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1895).

-----, Licht vom Osten (2nd & 3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1909).

De Wette, W. M. L., (revised by B. Brückner) Kurze Erklärung der Briefe des Petrus Judas und Jakobus (3rd ed. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1865).

Déaut, Roger Le, "Le Targum de Gen. 22,8 et 1 Pt. 1,20" (Recherches de Science Religieuse XLIX, 1961, pp. 103-106).

Delling, Gerhard, Der Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952).

Dey, Joseph, ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ: Ein Beitrag zur Klärung der religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung von Tit. 3:5 (Münster: Verlag der aschendorfschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937).

Dibelius, Martin, An die Kolosser, Epheser; an Philemon (HNT. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1953).

-----, Botschaft und Geschichte (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--; vol. I, 1953; vol. II, 1956).

-----, Der Brief des Jakobus (KEK. 9th ed. revised by Heinrich Greeven. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

-----, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (3rd ed. Ed. by G. Bornkamm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1959).

Dibelius, Martin, Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur (Sammlung Göschen. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1926, vol.II).

------ (-H.Conzelmann), Die Pastoralbriefe (HNT. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--,1955).

------ ,Studies in the Acts of the Apostles(ed. by H. Greeven. E.t. by M. Lind & Paul Schubert. London: SCM Press, 1956).

------ ,"Zur Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments -- ausserhalb der Evangelien--"(TR N.F. III, 1931, pp.207-242).

Dinkler, Erich, "Die Petrus-Rom-Frage"(TR XXV, 1958, pp. 189-230).

Dobschütz, E. von, "KYRIOS IESOUS"(ZNW XXX, 1931, pp. 97-123).

Dodd, C. H., According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., 1957).

------ ,The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper & Brothers, no date).

------ ,The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1954).

------ ,The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (MNTC. Harper & Brothers, 1932).

------ ,Gospel and Law (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

------ ,Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963).

------ ,The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960).

------ ,The Johannine Epistles (MNTC. Hodder & Stoughton, 1946).

------ ,"The primitive catechism and the sayings of Jesus"(in: New Testament Essays. Studies in memory of T. W. Manson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp.106-118).

Dölger, F. J., *Sol Salutis, Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum*(2nd ed. Münster: Aschendorff, 1925).

Driver, G. R.,*Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (abridged and revised ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957).

Driver, S. R.,*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (*ICC*. Edinburgh: T. & T.Clark, 1902).

-----,*An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950).

Duhm, Bernhard, *Das Buch Jesaja* (*GHAT*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922).

Dupont, Jacques,*The Sources of Acts* (E.t. by Kathaleen Pond. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964).

Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran*(E.t. by G. Vermes. *Meridian Books* ed. Cleveland/New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962).

Easton, B. S.,"The New Testament Ethical Lists"(*JBL* LI 1932, pp.1-12).

-----,*The Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947).

Edsmann, Carl-Martin,"Schöpfungswille und Beburt Jac.1: Eine Studie zur altchristliche Kosmologie"(*ZNW* XXXVIII, 1939, pp.11-44).

Ehrhardt, Arnold, *The Framework of the New Testament Stories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964).

Eichrodt, Walther, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag,vol.I, 5th ed., 1957; vol. II, 4th ed., 1961).

Elbogen, I., *Der Jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Leipzig: G. Fock, 1913).

Elliot-Binns, L. E., "James 1,18: Creation or Redemption?" (*NTS* III, 1956/57, pp.148-161).

Enslin, M. S., "The First Epistle of St. Peter"(a book-review)(*The Jewish Quarterly Review* N. S. XXXVII, 1946/47, pp.295-299).

------ ,*The Literature of the Christian Movement* (Part III of *Christian Beginnings*. *Harper Torchbooks* ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956).

Ewald, Georg Heinrich, *Sieben Sendschreiben den Neuen Bundes* (Göttingen: Dietersichschen Buchhandlung, 1870).

Farmer, William R.,*The Synoptic Problem* (New York: Macmillan Co./London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd.,1964).

Fascher, Erich, *Jesaja 53 in christlicher und jüdischer Sicht* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958).

------ ,"Petrusbriefe"(*RGG*. 3rd ed.vol.V, pp.257ff.).

Feine, Paul, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*(Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1913).

------ ,*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*(8th ed. revised by J. Behm. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1936).

------ ,*Die Gestalt des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses in der Zeit des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig: Doerffling & Franke, 1925).

Festigière, Le R. P.,*La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1953, vol.III).

Filson, Floyd V., *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord*(New York/Nashville: Abington Press, 1956),

------ ,*A New Testament History* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964).

------ ,"Partakers with Christ: Suffering in First Peter"(*Interpretation* IX, 1955, pp.400-412).

Fitzmyer, Joseph A.,"The Use of Explicit O. T. Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament"(*NTS* VII, 1960/61, pp.297-333).

Flemington, W. F., *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (London: S. P. C. K., 1964).

Foakes-Jackson, F. J.& Lake, Kirsopp (ed.), *The Beginnings of Christianity* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1926, vol.III).

Foerster, Werner, *Herr ist Jesus* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1924).

Fortna, Robert T.,"The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Chief Narrative Source used by the Fourth Evangelist"(Union Theological Seminary Th.D. dissertation, 1965).

Foster, Ora Delmer, *The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter"* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913, as part of the *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*,vol.XVII, pp.363-538).

Fransen, Dom Irénée, "Une homélie chretienne: la première Epître de Pierre"(*Bibel et Vie Chrétienne* Jan.,1960, pp.28-38).

Friedrich, Gerhard, "Lohmeyers These über 'Das paulinische Briefpräskript' kritisch beleuchtet"(*ZNW* XLVI, 1955, pp.272-274).

Frör, Kurt, "Salutationen, Benediktionen, Amen"(in: *Leiturgia*, vol.II. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1955, pp.569-597).

Fuller, Reginald H., *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965).

------ ,*The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1954).

Gächter, P., "Dolmetscher der Apostel"(*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* LX, 1936, pp.161-187).

Gall, A. F. von, *Basileia tou Theou* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926).

Gilmore, A. (ed.),*Christian Baptism* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1959).

Goguel, Maurice, "La seconde génération chrétienne" (*Revue de l'Histoire de Religions* CXXXVI, 1949, pp.180-202).

Goldammer, Kurt, "Der KERYGMA-Begriff in der ältesten christlichen Literatur"(*ZNW* XLVIII, 1957, pp.77-101).

Goltz, E. F. von der, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1901).

Goodspeed, E. J., *A History of Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942).

-----(ed.) ,*Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum* (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1960).

----- ,*New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927).

----- ,"Some Greek Notes: IV. Enoch in I. Peter 3:19"(*JBL* LXXIII, 1954, pp.91-92).

Goppelt, Leonhart, *Die apostolische und nachapostolische Zeit* (Bd.I, Lieferung A of *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

----- ,*Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954).

----- ,"Tradition nach Paulus"(*Kerygma und Dogma* IV, 1958, pp.213-233).

----- ,*TYPOS, Die Typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann,1939).

----- ,"Urchristentum"(*Evangesliche Kirchenlexikon* vol.III, pp.1581-1586).

Grant, Robert M., *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York/Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963).

Grässer, Erich, *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte* (*Beihefte zur ZNW* XX. 2nd ed. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957).

Grundmann, Walter, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*(2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961).

------ ,*Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962).

------ ,*Die Gotteskindschaft in der Geschichte Jesu und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen* (Weimar: Verlag Deutsche Christen, 1938).

------ ,"Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde" (*ZNW* XXXVIII, 1939, pp.45-73).

Gryglewicz, Felix, "Eine ursprungliche Taufliturgie als Quelle des 1. Briefes des Hl. Petrus"(*RBL* XI, 1958, pp.206-210).

Gschwind, K., *Die Niederfahrt Christi in die Unterwelt* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1911).

Gunkel, Hermann,"Der erste Brief des Petrus"(in: vol.III of *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917, pp.248-292).

------ ,"Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu bei Lukas"(in: *Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden A. von Harnack*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1921, pp.43-60).

Guthrie, D.,"Tertullian and Pseudonymity"(*Exp.T*. LXVII, 1956, pp.341-342).

Haenchen, Ernst, *Die Apostelgeschichte*(*KEK*. 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

Hanson, R. R. C.,*Tradition in the Early Church* (London: SCM Press, 1962).

Hahn Ferdinand, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

Harder, Günther, *Paulus und das Gebet* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1936).

Harnack, Adolf, *Die Chronologie der altchristliche Literatur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897, vol.I).

-----, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (E. t. by J. Moffatt. *Harper Torchbooks* ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961).

Harris, J. R., "The History of a Conjectural-Emendation" (*The Expositor* VI, 1902, pp.378-390).

-----, "On a Recent Emendation in the Text of St. Peter"(*The Expositor* V, 1902, pp.317-320).

-----, *Testimonies*(Oxford: The Clarendon Press, vol.I,1916; vol.II, 1920).

Hart, J. H. A., *The First Epistle General of Peter*(in: vol. V of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1910, pp.1-80).

Hatch, E. & Redpath, H. A. (ed.), *A Concordance to the Septuagint* Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1954. 2 vols.).

Hauck, Friedrich, *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes* (*NTD*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

Haussleiter, Johannes, *Trinitarische Glaube und Christusbekenntnis in der alten Kirche* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1920).

Henecke, Edgar (& Scheemelcher, Wilchelm)(ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, vol.I, 1959; vol.II, 1964).

Héring, Jean, *L'Epître aux Hébreux*(*CNT*. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1954).

-----, *La Première Epître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (*CNT*. Delachaux & Niestlé, 1949).

Heussi, Karl, *Die römische Petrustradition in kritischer Sicht* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1955).

Higgins, A. J. B., *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1952).

Hilgenfeld, Adolf, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neuen Testament* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1875).

Kirsch, E., "Petrus und Paulus"(*ZNW* XXIX, 1930, pp.63-76).

Hoad, J. W. L., "Some New Testament References to Isaiah 53"(*Exp.T*. LXVIII, 1957, pp.254-255).

Holtzmann, H. J., *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1892).

----- ,*Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (2nd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1911).

Hort, F. J. A., *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan & Co.,1898).

Howard, W. F., *Christianity according to St. John* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946).

Hunter, A. M., "The First Epistle of Peter"(on C. E. B. Cranfield, *The First Epistle of Peter*. *Exp.T*.LXI, 1950).

----- ,"Introduction and Exegesis on First Peter" (in: vol.XII of *The Interpreter's Bible*. New York/Nashville: Abington Press, 1957, pp.75ff.).

----- , *Paul and His Predecessors* (2nd ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961).

Jeremias, Joachim, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (*NTD*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

----- ,*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (E. t. by A. Ehrhardt from the 2nd German ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955).

----- ,*Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1958).

Jeremias, Joachim, "Kennzeichen der ipsissima vox Jesu" (in: *Synoptische Studien*. Wikenhauser-Festschrift. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953, pp.86-93).

----- ," Κεφαλή γωνίας - Ἀκρογωνιαῖος "(*ZNW* XXIX, 1930, pp.264-280).

----- "Das Lösegeld für Viele(Mk. 10, 45)" (*Judaica* III, 1947/48, pp.249-264).

----- ,"Zum Problem der Deutung von Jes. 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum"(in: *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chretienne*. M. Goguel-Festschrift. Neuchatel & Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950, pp. 113-119).

----- ,"Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern"(*ZNW* XL, 1949, pp.194-201).

Johnson, S. E., "The Preaching to the Dead"(*JBL* LXXIX, 1960, pp.48-51).

Johnston, G., "The Will of God, V: In I. Peter and I. John"(*Exp.T*. LXXII, 1961, pp.237-240).

Johnstone, Robert, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1888).

Jonas, Hans, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* (Teil I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1934).

Josephus, Flavius, *Flavi Iosephi Opera* (ed. by B. Niese. Berlin: Weidmammsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955. 5 vols.).

Jülicher, Adolf, *Einleitung in das Neuen Testament*(7th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1931).

Kaiser, O., Kümmel, W. G., Adam, G., *Einführung in die exegetischen Methoden* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1964).

Kaiser, Otto, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (Kaptitel 1-12. *ATD*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).

Kamlah, Ehrhard, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1964).

Karnetzki, Manfred, "Die galiläische Redaktion im Markusevangelium"(*ZNW* LII, 1961, pp.238-272).

Käsemann, Ernst, "Ein Neutestamentliche Ueberblick" (*Verkündigung und Forschung* 1949/50, 1952, p. 192).

----- ,*Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol.I, 3rd ed., 1964; vol.II, 1964).

----- ,"Liturgie, im N. T."(*RGG*. 3rd ed. vol.IV, pp.402-403).

----- ,"Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie"(in: *Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann zum 65. Geburtstag überreicht*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1949, pp.133-148).

----- ,*Das wandernde Gottesvolk* (4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).

Kattenbusch, Ferdinand, *Das apostolische Symbol*(Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894-1900. 2 vols.).

Kelly, J. N. D., *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (*MNTC*. London: A. C. Black, 1963).

----- ,*Early Christian Creeds* (2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1960).

Kennedy, H. A. A., *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions* (London/New York/Toronto: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913).

King, A. G., "Ephesians in the Light of Form Criticism" (*Exp.T*. LXIII, 1951/52, pp.273-276).

Kirk, K. E., *The Vision of God* (London/New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1931. esp.pp.111-130).

Kittel, G.(and Friedrich, G.)(ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933ff. vol.Iff.).

Kittel, Rud.(ed.), *Biblia Hebraica* (7th ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1951).

Klostermann, Erich, *Das Markusevangelium* (*HNT*. 4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1950).

Knopf, Rudolf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä* (*KEK*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912).

------ ,*Das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1905).

Knopf, R., Lietzmann, H.,Weinel, H., *Einführung in das Neue Testament* (5th ed. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1949).

Knox, John, *Christ the Lord* (Chicago/New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1945).

------ ,*The Church and the Reality of Christ* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

------ ,*The Death of Christ* (New York: Abington Press, 1958).

------ ,*The Early Church and the Coming Great Church* (New York: Abington Press, 1955).

------ ,*The Ethics of Jesus in the Teaching of the Church* (New York: Abington Press, 1961).

------ ,"Pliny and I. Peter: A Note on I Pet. 4:14-16 and 3:15"(*JBL* LXXII, 1953, pp.187-189).

Knox, W. L.,(a bookreview of E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*)(*Theology* XLIX, no.317, 1946, pp.342-344).

------ ,*St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1939).

Kosmalah, H., *Hebräer-Essener-Christen* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959).

Köster, Hermut, *Synoptische Ueberlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (*TU* no. 65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

Krafft, Eva, "Christologie und Anthropologie im 1. Petrusbrief"(*Evangelische Theologie* 1950, pp.120-126).

Kraus, H. -J., *Psalmen* (*BKAT.* 2nd ed. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961. 2 vols.).

Kroll, Josef, *Gott und Hölle*(Leipzig/Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1932).

Kühl, Ernst, *Die Briefe Petri und Judae* (*KEK*. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897).

Kuhn, Karl Georg, *Achzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1950).

-----, "Der Epheserbrief im Licht der Qumrantexte"(*NTS* VII, 1960/61, pp.334-346).

-----, "Jesus in Gethsemane"(*Evangelische Theologie* 1952/53, pp.260-285).

-----, "Πειρασμός, ἁμαρτία, σάρξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen"(*ZThK* XLIX, 1952, pp.200-222).

-----, "Das Problem der Mission in der Urchristenheit"(*Evangelische Missionszeitschrift* XI, 1954, pp.161-168).

Kulp, Hans-Ludwig, "Die Gemeindegebet im christlichen Gottesdienst"(in: vol.II of *Leiturgia*. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1955, pp.355-415).

Kümmel, K. G., "Judenchristentum"(*RGG*. 3rd ed. vol.III, pp.967-972).

-----, *Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus* (Zürich: Max Niehans/Uppsala: Seminarium Neotestamenticum Upsalense, 1943).

-----, *Das Neue Testament* (Freiburg/München: Verlag Karl Alber, 1958).

-----, *Promise and Fulfilment* (*SBT*. E. t. by D. M. Barton. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1956).

-----, "Urchristentum"(*TR* XIV, 1942, pp.81-95, 155-173; XVII, 1948/49, pp.3-50, 103-142; XVIII, 1950, pp.1-53).

Kunze, Gerhard, "Die Lesungen"(in: vol.II of Leiturgia. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1955, pp.87-180).

Kuss, Otto, Der Römerbrief (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet. 1st part, 1957; 2nd part, 1959).

------ ,"Zur paulinische und nachpaulinische Tauflehre im Neuen Testament"(Theologie und Glaube XLII, 1952, pp.401-425).

Leaney, A. R. C.,"I Peter and the Passover: an interpretation"(NTS X, 1963/64, pp.238-251).

Leconte, R., Les Epitres Catholiques (La Sainte Bible. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961).

Leenhardt, Franz-J., L'Epître de Saint Paul aux Romains (NTC. Neuchatel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1957).

Lichtenstein, E., "Die älteste christliche Glaubensformel" (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte LXIII, 1950, pp. 1-74).

Liddell, H. G.& Scott, R.(ed.), A Greek-English Lexicon (9th ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1958).

Lietzmann, Hans, (— Kümmel, K. G.) An die Kotinther I/II (HNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1949).

------ ,"Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses"(in: vol.III of his Kleine Schriften. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962, pp.163-181).

------ ,Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus (vol.I: Die vier Hauptbriefe. HNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr — Paul Siebeck—, 1910).

------ ,Messe und Herrenmahl (3rd ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1955).

------ ,"Die Urform des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses"(in: vol.III of his Kleine Schriften. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, pp.182-188).

Linton, Olof, "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Psalm CX"(NTS VII, 1960/61, pp.258-262).

Lohmeyer, Ernst, Die Briefe and die Kolosser und an Philemon (KEK. 10th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

------ ,Der Brief an die Philipper (KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

------ ,Das Evangelium des Markus (KEK. 14th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

------ ,Das Evangelium des Matthäus (KEK. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

------ ,Galiläa und Jerusalem (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936).

------ ,Kyrios Jesus, Ein Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11 (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928).

------ ,Die Offenbarung des Johannes (HNT. 2nd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1953).

------ ,Probleme paulinischer Theologie (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, undated).

------ ,"Σὺν Χριστῷ "(in: Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck --, 1927, pp.218-257).

------ ,"Vom urchristlichen Abendmahl"(TR IX, 1937, pp.168-227; 273-312; X, 1938, pp.91-99).

Lohse, Eduard, "Glaube und Werk"(ZNW XLVIII, 1957, pp. 1-22).

------ ,Die Offenbarung des Johannes (NTD. 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).

------, ,"Paränese und Kerygma im I. Petrusbrief" (ZNW XLV, 1954, pp.68-90).

Loofs, Friedrich, "Christ's Descent into Hell"(in: vol. II of The Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religion. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1908, pp.290-301).

Love, Julian Price, "The First Epistle of Peter" (Interpretation VIII, 1954, pp.290-301).

Lundberg, P., La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Eglise (Leipzig: A. Lorenz, 1942).

McGiffert, Arthur Cushmann, History of the Apostolic Age (revised ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897).

McKelvey, R. C., "Christ the Cornerstone"(NTS VIII, 1961/62, pp.352-359).

McNeile, A. H., The Gospel according to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan & Co., 1915).

------ ,Introduction to the Study of the New Testament (2nd ed., revised by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953).

Major, H. D. A., Manson, T. W., Wright, C. T., The Mission and Message of Jesus (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1953).

Mandelkern, Solomon, Vereris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraecae atque Chaldaicae (Tel-Aviv: Sumptibus, Schocken Hierosolymis, 1959).

Margot, Jean-Claude, Les Epîtres de Pierre (Genève: Editions Labor et Fides, 1960).

Martin, R. P., "The Composition of I Peter in Recent Study"(in: the first issue of Vox Evangelica. London: The Epworth Press, 1962, pp.29-42).

------ ,An Early Christian Confession (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960).

Marxen, Willi, Der Evangelist Markus (2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959).

------ ,Einleitung in das Neue Testament(Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963).

Masson, Charles, L'Epître de Saint Paul aux Ephesiens (CNT. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1953).

Massaux, Ed., "Le texte de la I^{a} Petri du Papyrus Bodmer VIII(p^{72})"(Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses XXXIX, 1963, pp.613-671).

Mayor, J. B., *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan & Co./ New York: The Macmillan & Co., 1907).

Meecham, H. G., "The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament"(*Exp.T*.LVIII, 1947, pp.207-208).

Meyer, Arnold, *Das Rätschel des Jakobusbrief* (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1930).

Meyer, Eduard, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (4th & 5th ed. Stuttgart: J. C. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1924. 3vols.).

Meyer, Rudolf, *Hellenistische in der rabbinischen Anthropologie* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1937).

Michaelis, Wilhelm, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2nd ed. Bern: Berehthold Haller, 1954).

------ ,"Kennen die Synoptiker eine Verzögerung der Parusie?"(in: *Synoptische Studien*. Wikenhauser-Festschrift. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1953, pp. 107-123).

Michel, Otto, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (*KEK*. 10th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

------ ,*Der Brief an die Römer* (*KEK*. 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

------ ,*Paulus und seine Bibel* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929).

Michl, Johann, *Der Brief an die Hebräer und die Katholischen Briefe* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1953, pp.193-230).

Milik, J. T.,*Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judae* (*SBT*. E. t. by J. Strugnell. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1959).

Mitton, C. L.,*The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951).

------ ,"The Relationship between 1. Peter and Ephesians"(*JThS* N.S. I, 1950, pp.67-73).

Miller, D. G., "Deliverance and Destiny: Salvation in First Peter"(*Interpretation* IX, 1955, pp.413-425).

Moffatt, James, *The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Judas* (*MNTC*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928).

----- , *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918).

Mole, J., "Laymanship"(*Scottish Journal of Theology* XIV, 1961, pp.380-389).

Monnier, Jean, *La Première Epître de l'Apôtre Pierre* (Macon: Protat Frères, 1900).

Moore, George Foot, *Judaism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. 3 vols.).

Morrison, Clinton D., *The Powers That Be* (*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1960).

Moule, C. F. D., *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York/Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962).

----- , *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*(2nd ed. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958).

----- , "The Purpose and Structure of I. Peter" (*NTS* III, 1956, pp.1-11).

----- , "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament"(*JThS* N. S. I, 1950, pp.29-41).

----- , *Worship in the New Testament* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961).

Moulton, James Hope, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (vol.I:Prolegomena. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908).

Moulton, J. H. & Howard, W. F., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (vol.II:Accidents and Word-Formation; Semitisms in the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960).

Mowinckel, Sigmund, *He That Cometh* (E. t. by G. W. Anderson. New York/Nashville: Abington Press, 1954).

Mowinckel, Sigmund, *Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmdichtung* (vol. V of his *Psalmenstudien*. Christiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1924).

Munck, Johannes, *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (København: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, 1954).

Mussner, Franz, *Der Jakobusbrief* (*HTKNT*. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1964).

Nauck, Wolfgang, "Eph. 2, 19-22 — ein Tauflied?" (*Evangelische Theologie* XIII, 1953, pp. 362-371).

-----, "Freude im Leiden: zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition" (*ZNW* XLVI, 1955, pp. 68-80).

-----, "Das οὖν-Paräneticum" (*ZNW* XLIX, 1958, pp. 134-135).

-----, "Problem des frühchristlichen Amtsverständnisses" (*ZNW* XLVIII, 1957, pp. 200-220).

-----, *Die Tradition und Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1967).

Neuenzeit, Paul, *Das Herrenmahl* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1960).

Neufeld, Vernon H., *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963).

Neugebauer, Fritz, *In Christus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).

-----, "Das paulinische 'In Christo'" (*NTS* IV, 1957/58, pp. 124-138).

Niebergall, Alfred, "Die Geschichte der christlichen Predigt" (in: vol. II of *Leiturgia*. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1955, pp. 181-353).

Norden, Eduard, *Agnostos Theos* (4th ed. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1956).

North, Christopher R., *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).

Noth, Martin, *Das dritte Buch Mose* (*ATD*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

------ ,*Das zweite Buch Mose* (*ATD*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959).

Nötscher, F., *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumrantexte* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1956).

Oepke, Albrecht, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (*THNT*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960).

Oesterley, W. O. E., *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925).

Percy, Ernst, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946).

Perdelwitz, Richard, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des 1. Petrusbriefes* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1911).

Pfeiffer, E., "Der alttestamentliche Hintergrund der liturgischen Formel 'Amen'"(*Kerygma und Dogma* IV, 1958, pp.129-141).

Pierce, C. A.,*Conscience in the New Testament* (*SBT*. London: SCM Press, 1955).

Porter, F. C.,*The Mind of Christ in Paul* (New York/London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932).

Prigent, P., "Quelques testimonia messianiques"(*TZ* XV, 1959, pp.419-430).

Pritchard, J. B., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*(2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955).

von Rad, Gerhard, *Deuteronomium-Studien*(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947).

------ ,*Das fünfte Buch Mose*(*ATD*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

von Rad, Gerhard, Theologie des Alten Testaments (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, vol.II, 1960).

Rademacher, L., "Der erste Petrusbrie und Silvanus" (ZNW XXV, 1926, pp.287-299).

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.), Septuaginta (5th ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstanlt, 1952. 2 vols.).

Ramsey, W. M., "The Church and the Empire in the First Century", no. 3:'The First Epistle attributed to St. Peter'(The Expositor 4th series. VIII, 1893, pp.282-296).

------ ,The Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170 (3rd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894).

Raney, W. H., The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Christian Cults (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933).

Rawlinson, A. E. J., St Mark (WC. London: Methuen & Co., 1925).

Reicke, Bo, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism (København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1946).

------, ,The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude (The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday & Co.,1964).

------ ,"Die Gnosis der Männer nach I. Ptr.3,7" (in: Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954, pp.296-304).

Reindell, Walter, "Präfation"(in: vol.II of Leiturgia. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1955, pp.453-521).

Reitzenstein, Richard, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (3rd ed. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956).

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (NTD. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952).

------ ,"Die ntl. Mahnungen an die Frau, sich dem Manne unterzuordnen"(in: Verbum Dei manet in aeternum. O.Schmitz-Festschrift. Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1953, pp.131-145).

Resch, Alfred, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis* (*TU*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904).

The Revised Standard Version of the Bible (New York/ Toronto/Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1953).

Richards, G. C., "I Ptr. 3:21"(*JThS* XXXII, 1931, p.77).

Richardson, Alan, *An Introduction to the Theology of New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1958).

——— ,*Creeds in the Making* (London: SCM Press, 1935).

Riddle, D. W., "Die Verfolgungslogien im formgeschichtlicher und soziologischer Bedeutung"(*ZNW* XXXIII, 1934, pp.271-289).

Riesenfeld, Harald,"La descente dans la mort"(in: *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne, Mélanges M. Goguel*.Neuchatel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950, pp. 207-217).

Rigaux, B., *Saint Paul: Les Epitres aux Thessaloniciens* (Gebloux: Duculot/ Paris:Babalda, 1956).

Robertson, A., Plummer, A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (*ICC*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911).

Robinson, J. A. T., *Twelve New Testament Studies* (*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1962).

Roller, Otto, *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933).

Ropes, James Harley, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (*ICC*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916).

Sanday, W., Headlam, A. C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (*ICC*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910).

Scharfe, Ernst, *Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur* (Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1893).

Scharfe, Ernst, "Die schriftstellerische Originalität des ersten Petrusbriefs"(Theologische Studien und Kritiken 1889, pp.633-670).

Scharlemann, Martin H., "Why the 'Kurion' in 1. Peter 1:25?"(Concordia Theological Monthly XXX, 1959, pp. 352-357).

Schattenmann, J., "The Little Apocalypse of the Synoptics and the First Epistle of Peter"(Theology Today XI, 1954, pp.193-198).

------ ,Studien zum neutestamentlichen Prosahymnus (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung,1956).

Schelkle, Karl Hermann, Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle, 1949).

------ ,Die Petrusbriefe; der Judasbrief (HTKNT. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1961).

Schille, Gottfried, "Das Leiden des Herrn"(ZThK LII, 1955, pp.161-205).

------ ,"Zur urchristlichen Tauflehre, Stilistische Beobachtungen am Barnabasbrief"(ZNW XLIX, 1958, pp. 31-52).

Schlatter, Adolf, Petrus und Paulus nach dem ersten Petrusbrief (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1937).

Schlier, Heinrich, Der Brief an die Epheser (4th ed. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963).

------ ,Der Brief an die Galater (KEK. 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951).

------ ,Die Zeit der Kirche (Freiburg: Herder,1956).

------ ,Principalities and Powers in the New Testament (Questiones Disputatae. New York: Herder & Herder, 1961).

Schmidt, Hans Wilhelm, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (THNT. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962).

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, "Israels Stellung zu den Fremdlingen und Beisassen und Israels Wissen um seine Fremdlins- und Beisassenschaft"(*Judaica* I, 1945/46, pp.269-296).

Schmidt, P., "Zwei Frages zum ersten Petrusbrief" (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 1908, pp.24-52).

Schmoller, Alfred (ed.), *Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament* (11th ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, no date).

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, "Episkopos und Hirtenamt (Zu Apg. 20, 28)"(in: *Episcopus*, Faulhaber-Festschrift. Regensburg: Gregorius-Verlag, Vorm. Friedrich Pustet, 1949, pp.66-88).

----- ,*Gottes Herrschaft und Reich* (3rd ed. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1963).

----- ,*Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (*Questiones Disputatae*. 2nd ed. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1961).

----- ,*Die Johannesbriefe* (*HTKNT*. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1953).

----- ,*Die sittlische Botschaft des Neuen Testament* (München: Max Heuber, 1954).

Schneider, Johannes, *Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes* (*NTD*. 9th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).

----- ,*Die Passionmystik des Paulus*(Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1929).

Schniewind, Julius, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (*NTD*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

----- ,*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (*NTD*. 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

Schoeps, Hans-Joachim, *Paulus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr —Paul Siebeck—, 1959).

Schubert, Kurt, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer*(München/ Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1958).

Schubert, Paul, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgiving* (*ZNW* Beiheft 20. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1939).

Schultz, Anselm, O. S. B., "Leidenstheologie und Vorbildethik in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen"(in: *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, Josef-Schmid-Festschrift. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963, pp.265-269).

Schulze, Gerhard, "Die Stellung des Petrus in der Urchristenheit"(*TLZ* VIII, 1956, pp.1-14).

Schweizer, Eduard, *Church Order in the New Testament* (*SBT*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1961).

----- , *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1955).

----- , *Der erste Petrusbrief* (*Prophezei*. 2nd ed. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949).

----- , "1. Pet. 4, 6, *eis* *touto* ... *pneumati*" (*TZ* VIII, 1952, pp.152-154).

----- , *Neotestamentica* (Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli-Verlag, 1963).

Seeberg, Alfred, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903).

Seeberg, Reinhold, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (vol.I: *Die Anfänge des Dogmas im nachapostolischen Zeitalter*. Basel/Stuttgart: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1960).

Selwyn, E. G., "Eschatology in I Peter"(in: *The Background and its Eschatology of the New Testament*, C. H. Dodd-Festschrift. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, pp.394-401).

----- , *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (4th ed. London: Macmillan & Co., 1952).

----- , "The Persecution in I Peter"(in the no.1 of the bulletin, *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*. Cambridge: The University Press, pp.39-50).

----- , "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Problem of the Authorship of I. Peter"(*Exp.T.* LIX, 1948, pp.256-258).

Seufert, W., "Die Abhängigkeit des I Petr. vom Römerbrief"(*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 1874, pp.360-388).

Shepherd, Massey H.,Jr., *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960).

Simpson, E. K., *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1954).

Sjöberg, E.,"Wiederbeburt und Neuschöphung im palästinischen Judentum"(*Studia Theologica* IV,1951, pp. 44-85).

Skinner, M., "The Ministry of the Layman in the Church" (*London Quarterly and Holbourn Review* XXXI, 1962, pp.8-13).

von Soden, Hans, *Der erste Brief des Petrus* (in: vol.III of *HCNT*. Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1899, pp.116-167).

Soltau, W., "Die Einheitlichkeit des I. Petrusbriefs" (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 1905, pp.302-315).

Spicq, C., *L'Epître aux Hébreux* (2nd ed. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1953. 2 vols.).

------ ,*Les Epitres Pastorales* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1947).

Spitta, Friedrich, *Christi Predigt an die Geister* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1890).

Spörri, Theophil, *Der Gemeindegedanke im 1. Petrusbrief* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925).

Stählin, Gustav, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (*NTD*. 10th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

Stauffer, Ethelbert, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1945).

Stendahl, Krister (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957).

Stibbs, Alan M., The First Epistle General of Peter (The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. London: The Tyndale Press, 1959. Introduction by A. F. Walls).

Strack, H. J. & Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926-61. 6 vols).

Strathmann, Hermann, Das Evangelium nach Johannes (NTD. 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955).

----- , Das Evangelium nach Markus (NTD. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

----- , "Die Stellung des Petrus in der Urkirche" (Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie XX, 1943, pp.223-282).

Streeter, B. H., The Primitive Church (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1929).

Strobel, August, "Macht Leiden von Sünde frei? — Zur Problematik von 1. Pet. 4, 1f." (Theologische Zeitschrift XIX, 1963, pp.412-425).

----- , "Passa-Symbolik und Passa-Wunder in Act. XII:3ff." (NTS IV, 1957/58, pp.210-215).

Stuiber, Alfred, "Amen" (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum. I, 1958, pp.153-159).

Taylor, Vincent, The Atonement in the New Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1950).

----- , The Gospel according to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., 1959).

----- , Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan & Co., 1937).

Teichert, H., "I. Ptr. 2:13 — eine crux interpretum?" (TLZ LXXIV, 1954, pp.303-304).

Testuz, Michel (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX (Colony-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1959).

Thackeray, H. St. J., *A Grammar of the Old Testament Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909. vol.I).

Thornton, T. C. G., "I. Peter, A Paschal Liturgy?" (*JThS* XII, 1961, pp.14-26).

Turner, Nigel, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (vol. III: Syntax. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963).

Twisselmann, Willi, *Die Gotteskindschaft der Christen nach dem Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939).

Ulonska, Herbert, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den paulinischen Briefe* (Münster: Max Kramer, 1963).

van Unnik, W. C., "Christianity according to I. Peter" (*Exp.T*. LXVIII, 1956, pp.198-202).

-----, "A Classical Parallel to 1 Peter 2, 14 and 20" (*NTS* II, 1955/56, pp.198-202).

-----, "The Teaching of Good Works in I. Peter" (*NTS* I, 1954, pp.92-110).

Usteri, Joh. Martin, *Wissenschaftlicher und Praktischer Commentar über der ersten Petrusbrief* (Zürich: S. Höhr, 1887).

Vandervorst, J., "Dispersion ou Diaspora" (in: *Supplément au Dictionaire de la Bible*, vol.II, columns 432-445).

Vetus Latina (Erzabtei Beuron, ed.)(no.26, part II, 1.Ptr. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1957).

Vögtle, A., *Die Tugend- und Lasterkatalog im Neuen Testament* (Münster: Verlag der aschendorfschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936).

Völter, Daniel, *Der erste Petrusbrief; Seine Entstehung und Stellung in der Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Strassburg: J. H. Ed. Heitz, 1906).

Voltz, Paul, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba* (Tübingen/Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1903).

Vriezen, Th. C. C., *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (Newton: Charles T. Branford, 1960).

Wand, J. W. C., *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (*WC*. London: Methuen & Co., 1934).

------ ,"The Lessons of First Peter: A Survey of Recent Interpretation"(*Interpretation* IX, 1955, pp. 287-299).

Weidinger, K., *Die Haustafeln, Ein Stück urchristlicher Paränese* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1928).

Weiser, A., *Die Psalmen* (*ATD*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955, 2 vols).

Weiss, Bernhard, *Der erste Petrusbrief und die neuere Kritik* (Berlin: Verlag von Edwin Runge, 1906).

------ ,*Der petrinische Lehrbegriff* (Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Schultze, 1855).

Weiss, Johannes, *Earliest Christianity* (E. t. and ed. by F. C. Grant. *Harper Torchbooks* ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 2 vols).

Wendland, H.-D., *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (*NTD*. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).

Wendland, Paul, *Die urchristlichen Literaturformen* (*HNT*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1912).

Werner, Martin, *Der Einfluss paulinische Theologie im Markusevangelium* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1923).

Westcott, Brooke Foss, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951. Photolithoprint reissue).

Whiston, William (trans.), *The Works of Flavius Josephus* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1889. 2 vols.).

Wibbing, Siegfried, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkatalog im Neuen Testament* (*ZNW* Beiheft 25. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1959).

Wieneck, G., *Paulus über Jesu Tod* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939).

Wifstrand, Albert, "Stylistic Problems in the Epistles of James and Peter"(*Studia Theologica* I, 1948, pp. 170-182).

Wikenhauser, Alfred, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (3rd ed. Basel/Freiburg/Wien: Herder, 1959).

------ ,*Die Christusmystik des Apostels Paulus* (2nd ed. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1956).

Wilckens, Ulrich, "Kerygma und Evangelium bei Lukas" (*ZNW* XLIX, 1958, pp.223-237).

------ ,*Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961).

Windisch, Hans (-- Preisker, H.), *Die katholischen Briefe*(*HNT*. 3rd ed. J. C. B. Mohr --Paul Siebeck--, 1951).

------ ,*Der zweite Korintherbrief* (*KEK*. 9th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924).

Wingren, Gustaf, "Das dreigliedrige Glaubensbekenntnis" (*Kerygma und Dogma* IV, 1958, pp.61-72).

Wohlenberg, G., *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief* (*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1915).

Wolff, Hans Walter, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum* (3rd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1952).

Wrede, Wilhelm, "Bemerkungen zu Harnacks Hypothese über die Adresse des I. Petrusbriefs"(*ZNW* I, 1900, pp. 75-85).

Zahn, Theodor, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2nd ed. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900. 2 vols.).

Kubo, Sakae, *p^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965).

A PRECIS OF

THE FORMULARY MATERIAL IN I PETER

A Study According to the Method of *Traditionsgeschichte*

Problem

It has been rather customary to take the literary similarities shared by any two writings of the N.T. as indicative of a certain direct relation between the two writings. In the case of the similarities shared by I Peter and the Pauline (or deutero-Pauline) epistles, they have been often regarded by scholars as evidence for the former's direct literary dependence upon the latter.

Recent developments in the N.T. studies, notably the form-critical inquiry, seem to force us to re-examine the hitherto dominant view, by taking up, for instance, the possibility that the similarities may be traced back to traditional, common formulations current in the early Church.

Methodology

Our examination of the literary similarities is carried out from a 'history-of-tradition' (traditionsgeschichtliche) point of view. By this methodological position we mean an attempt 1) to recognize, on the basis of exegetical examination (which is oriented basically toward the form-critical inquiry) of a given text, traditional material of various sorts, or traces of it, 2) to inquire into the relation of this piece of traditional material to other theological traditions which were current in the early Church and are reflected in the N.T. writings, and 3) to establish the place of the material in the context of the history of thought of the early Church.

Procedure

In this study we are primarily concerned with examining the traditional 'formulary' material in I Peter.

1. The first section of each chapter is devoted either to the definition of the Gattung (with regard to the passages, the Gattungen of which seem almost self-explanatory) or to the detection and definition of traditional formulary material. The latter twofold inquiry takes the following steps:

A. to detect the formulary material, by noting a) terminological and other features which seem to distinguish the passage under consideration from the rest of the Epistle, b) the 'formulary' features which correspond to the formulary criteria, surveyed in Section 2 of Chapter I in Part Two, c) the context-analytical *aporia*, and d) the parallel instances found elsewhere in the N.T.; then we go on

B. a) to define the scope of the piece, b) to reconstruct the possible original text, and c) to assign a possible *Gattung* to the reconstructed piece.

2. The second section is devoted (in most of the chapters) to the history-of-tradition examination proper of the formulary piece, by relating the piece (or segments of it) to its possible N.T. parallels of various sorts. The range of the parallels is not limited to those in the Pauline or the deutero-Pauline epistles.

3. With reference to the instances which exhibit remarkable affinities, a question is raised whether or not those affinities may be regarded as indicative of one's direct literary dependence upon the other.

Results

1. We have detected the following pieces of traditional, formulary material in I Peter:

A. Salutation formulae in 1:2 (5:14).
B. A eulogical formula in 1:3-4.
C. A fragmentary theological formula in 1:17a.
D. A hymnic fragment in 1:18-19.
E. A Christological formula in 1:20; 3:18, 19, 22.
F. Doxological formulae and *Amen* in 4:11d; 5:11.

2. Among these pieces (or segements of them), there is no piece of positive evidence to prove that

any one of them is directly dependent upon the Pauline or deutero-Pauline epistles. Certain affinities exhibited by them may be ascribed to the fact that they may be dependent upon the common, traditional formulations current in the early Church.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Kazuhito Shimada was born to the Rev. and Mrs. Sueguma Shimada as their first child on May 29, 1933. The father has been the pastor of Sumoto Free Methodist Church (Sumoto, Japan) since March 23, 1940.

Received the primary school education in Sumoto Daini Primary School (April, 1940--March, 1946).

Graduated from Hyogo-Prefectural Sumoto Junior High School in March, 1952.

Graduated from Osaka Christian College (Osaka, Japan) in March, 1956 (valedictorian); was awarded the Tsuchiyama Memorial Scholarship, which was intended to encourage students to study abroad, at the commencement.

Studied in Greenville College (Greenville, Illinois), a Free Methodist-related school, for a year (September, 1956--May, 1957).

Graduated, with the degree of B.D., from McCormick Theological Seminary (Chicago, Illinois), in May, 1960; was awarded the Seminary's T.B. Blackstone Fellowship in New Testament Greek, which was designed for two years of graduate study, at the commencement.

Graduated, with the degree of S.T.M., from Union Theological Seminary (New York, New York) in May, 1961.

Admitted to the Th.D. program in the same seminary in September, 1961.

Served as a research assistant to Dr. J. Louis Martyn for a year (1961-1962).